

He also presented memorials of local branches of the Connecticut State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, of Waterbury, East Hartford, Bridgeport, New Haven, Glastonbury, Guilford, and Cornwall, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Stamford and South Norwalk, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented memorials of Norwich Camp, No. 75, Order Sons of Zion, of Norwich; of the Council of the United Hebrews, of Waterbury; of the Adath Israel Congregation, of Bridgeport; and of Local Lodge No. 21, Order of B'rith Abraham, and 25 other Hebrew organizations of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of General Mansfield Council, No. 9, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Middletown, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of sundry merchandise brokers, of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against the war tax as applied to merchandise brokers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Fram Lodge, No. 13, International Order of Good Templars, of Everett; of sundry citizens of Tweedle; of Ancor Lodge, No. 3, International Order of Good Templars, of New Castle; and of Lincoln Lodge, No. 122, International Order of Good Templars, of Woodinville, all in the State of Washington, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I present a letter from J. C. Adams, of Kent, Wash., together with articles and newspaper clippings relating to the Japanese labor problem and immigration. I move that the letter and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 7092) granting an increase of pension to Prudie M. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 7093) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1094) granting an increase of pension to John H. Van Meter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7095) granting an increase of pension to Addie M. Higgins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 7096) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Smith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7097) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Weed (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7098) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hoary (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7099) granting an increase of pension to Silas S. Beckwith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7100) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Lane (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. THORNTON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$4,000 for a reviser of the United States Statutes, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for salary for clerk hire in the offices of shipping commissioners from \$35,000 to \$35,900, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LEE of Maryland submitted an amendment providing that whenever there are general rules, regulations, or requirements of any character as to the general milk supply of the District of Columbia no part of the appropriation provided for under this bill shall be expended for examinations or inspections, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19422), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m., Thursday, December 31, 1914) the Senate took a recess until Saturday, January 2, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 31, 1914.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Frederick M. Hedger to be register of the land office at Walla Walla, Wash.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

T. J. Kelly, Oakville.

IDAHO.

William T. Roberts, Bellevue.

MICHIGAN.

James C. Beckwith, Marshall.

Charlie W. Beier, Lenox.

Powell Brody, Lawton.

James J. Byers, Houghton.

Patrick Garvey, Hemlock.

Earl Hunter, Lowell.

Frederick J. Kruger, Centerville.

Myron E. Miller, Charlotte.

Patrick H. Schannenck, Chassell.

F. Raymond Wallbrecht, Central Lake.

MISSISSIPPI.

A. C. Fant, Macon.

Nannie Stuart, Morton.

OHIO.

F. N. Cary, New Richmond.

Jacob C. Hoch, Spencerville.

Jacob E. Mercer, Hicksville.

Bernard Sherman, Minster.

William A. White, Crestline.

OKLAHOMA.

Clarence G. Dalton, Mounds.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James J. McArdle, Nesquehoning.

Frank P. Moats, Smithfield.

James G. Paul, Bradford.

George F. Trout, Stewartstown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 31, 1914.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We rejoice, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, in the great precepts enunciated by the Master in the marvelous Sermon on the Mount and in His wonderful parables, acknowledged by a consensus of the purest minded in all the world as conducive to the highest civilization, and we most earnestly pray that we may not only appreciate their worth but make them ours by assimilation and put them into the affairs of daily life after the manner of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 31, 1914.

HON. CHAMPE CLARK,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the governor of the State of New York my resignation as a Repre-

representative in the Congress of the United States from the second district of New York.

Yours, respectfully,

DENIS O'LEARY.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19906, the Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aiken	Donohoe	Hughes, W. Va.	Parker, N. Y.
Alney	Doolling	Hulings	Patten, N. Y.
Allen	Doughton	Jones	Patton, Pa.
Anderson	Driscoll	Keister	Peters
Ansberry	Dunn	Kelly, Pa.	Peterson
Anthony	Eagan	Kennedy, Iowa	Phelan
Austin	Edmonds	Kettner	Platt
Avis	Edwards	Kinkaid, N. J.	Plumley
Bailey	Elder	Kitchin	Porter
Baltz	Esch	Knowland, J. R.	Pou
Barchfeld	Evans	Korby	Powers
Barnhart	Fairchild	Kreider	Price
Bartlett	Faison	Langham	Ragsdale
Barton	Farr	Lee, Ga.	Riordan
Beall, Tex.	Fess	L'Engle	Roberts, Nev.
Borchers	Fields	Levy	Rothermel
Bowdle	Floyd, Ark.	Lewis, Pa.	Sabath
Britten	Fordney	Lieb	Scully
Brockson	French	Lindbergh	Seldomridge
Brodbeck	Gallagher	Lindquist	Sells
Brown, W. Va.	Gallivan	Lobeck	Shackelford
Bruckner	Gardner	Loft	Shreley
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	Logue	Shreve
Bulkley	Garrett, Tex.	McAndrews	Sisson
Burke, Pa.	George	McClellan	Slayden
Burke, Wis.	Gerry	McGuire, Okla.	Slomp
Burnett	Gillett	McKenzie	Smith, J. M. C.
Butler	Glittins	Mahan	Stafford
Calder	Godwin, N. C.	Manahan	Stanley
Callaway	Goeke	Mapes	Stephens, Miss.
Cantor	Goldfogle	Martin	Stevens, N. H.
Cantrill	Good	Metz	Sutherland
Carew	Gordon	Miller	Talbott, Md.
Carlin	Gorman	Mondell	Taylor, Ala.
Carr	Graham, Ill.	Montague	Taylor, N. Y.
Cary	Graham, Pa.	Morgan, La.	Ten Eyck
Clancy	Greene, Mass.	Morin	Townsend
Clark, Fla.	Gregg	Moss, W. Va.	Tuttle
Claypool	Guernsey	Mott	Underhill
Cline	Hamill	Mulkey	Vare
Coady	Hamilton, N. Y.	Murdock	Vaughan
Collier	Hammond	Neeley, Kans.	Vinson
Connolly, Iowa	Hart	Necly, W. Va.	Walker
Conry	Haugen	Nelson	Wallin
Copley	Haves	Nolan, J. I.	Walsh
Dale	Heflin	O'Brien	Walters
Davenport	Helvering	Oglesby	White
Davis	Hensley	O'Halr	Wilson, Fla.
Decker	Hill	O'Leary	Wilson, N. Y.
Deltrick	Hinebaugh	O'Shaunessy	Winslow
Dershem	Houston	Paige, Mass.	Woodruff
Differderfer	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer	
Dixon			

After the Clerk had completed the calling of the roll, the Speaker announced that 205 Members had answered "present."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that warrants be issued for the absentees and that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to arrest them and bring them in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that warrants be issued for the absentees and that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to arrest them and bring them in.

The motion was agreed to.

Subsequently 14 more Members appeared and answered to their names.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventeen Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19906, the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SAUNDERS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 14. That the appropriation for the manufacture of postage stamps be so amended that advance payment can be made to the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the printing of postage stamps.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 47, by striking out section 14.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the necessity for this provision. At present, under the law, the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is permitted to do what is known as repay work for the Post Office Department. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing submitted bids for the printing of the postage stamps, and was the successful bidder. Under the provision which is carried in connection with the appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing the work is done out of appropriations made for the bureau, and the bureau is reimbursed by the Post Office Department as the stamps are delivered. What particular advantage there is to be gained by paying the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in advance for this work I do not know. It may have one effect, and one effect only, and that should not, in my opinion, be permitted. In estimating upon this work the bureau fixes as the price the cost of the labor and materials, with a certain percentage added to cover the overhead charges. As nearly as possible it is attempted to do the work at cost, but there is a very considerable profit to the bureau in the doing of the work. Last year the sum of \$32,000 was not received from the Post Office Department for such work until after the close of the fiscal year. That sum was a portion of the profit that was made. Not having been received during the fiscal year, it went into the Treasury. If it had been received before the end of the fiscal year, it would have been available in addition to the appropriations made for the bureau. It is very difficult to keep track of what the bureau actually has available each year.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this is a section which the department asked to have placed in the bill. It is one about which the committee care but little, and I understand that the department is not particularly anxious about it. Therefore, if there is any serious objection to the section, or any complication should arise such as the gentleman from New York suggests, I am entirely satisfied to see the section go out of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not see any advantage to the Post Office Department, and for that reason I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing prints these stamps?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. In large quantities?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And holds them until such time as the department wants them? Is that correct?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They may be stored for the Post Office Department. The bureau makes a contract to print the stamps, and the orders are given and the stamps are printed as required. It may be that they are held in the bureau until delivery is called for.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand; but what I was getting at was whether the Bureau of Engraving and Printing held a large quantity of these stamps until such time as the Post Office Department wanted them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; except that it may be convenient to store them there. That is all. They have no authority to print them until they are ordered, and if they are ordered and printed the department must pay for them.

Mr. FOSTER. They are paid for as soon as they are printed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know the particular arrangement made for the payment. The only result of this provision would be that if they paid for these stamps in advance the bureau would have available for its use, in addition to the appropriation made for its work, the entire profit it may make on this contract. It just so happened that last year \$32,000 were not paid until after the expiration of the fiscal year. That sum went into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. If it had been paid before the 30th of June it would have been expended in the bureau, and it adds a certain amount of money

over which we have no control, and we can not estimate on how much it would be.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that if there is to be a repealing clause in this act it would be better to put it in as a separate section at the end, where people would naturally look for it. It came in here, I take it, as a part of the bill that we passed last summer.

Mr. MOON. That is true.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the gentleman offer an amendment to strike it out of that place and insert it later, if he desires, as a separate section at the end of the bill.

Mr. MOON. We can put it at the end of the bill. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 6 and 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, strike out lines 6 and 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 19. That section 3949 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"All contracts for carrying the mail should be in the name of the United States, and shall be awarded to the lowest bidder tendering sufficient guaranties for faithful performance in accordance with the terms of the advertisement: *Provided, however,* That such contracts require due celerity, certainty, and security in the performance of the service; but the Postmaster General shall not be bound to consider the bid of any person who has willfully or negligently failed to perform a former contract."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 18 insert the following:

"Whenever it shall be established to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General that any person is engaged or represents himself as engaged in the business of publishing any obscene or immoral books, pamphlets, pictures, prints, engravings, lithographs, photographs, or other publications, matter, or thing of an indecent, immoral, scurrilous, or libelous character, and if such person shall, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, endeavor to use the post office for the promotion of such business, it is hereby declared that no letter, packet, parcel, newspaper, book, or other thing sent or sought to be sent through the post office by or on behalf of or to or on behalf of such person shall be deemed mailable matter, and the Postmaster General shall make the necessary rules, and regulations to exclude such non-mailable matter from the mails."

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to give to the Postmaster General authority which apparently he does not possess at the present time. He discusses the question of obscene and scurrilous matter in the mails somewhat elaborately in his annual report, and calls attention to the fact that considerable complaint has been made of publications characterized as obscene, indecent, and scurrilous in their character.

The Postmaster General reviews the law and the decisions under certain provisions of the criminal code. It has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that an immoral and obscene publication to come within the statute must be one which must incite persons to obscene or immoral acts and at the same time tend to degrade public morals. It has been pointed out, however, that there are many matters of a vulgar, coarse, scurrilous, lewd, and outrageously offensive character that do not come within the provisions of existing laws and for which apparently there is no remedy. The pending amendment is so framed that it will not permit injustice to be done to anyone, and yet can hardly be objected to as an improper exercise by an executive department of power which should properly be reposed in it. The proposed legislation requires the establishment of two facts. One is that a person shall be engaged, or shall represent himself as engaged, in the business of publishing immoral books, pamphlets, pictures, prints, engravings, lithographs, photographs, or other publication, matter, or thing of an indecent, immoral, scurrilous, or libelous character. The fact must first be established to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General that a person is engaged in such business, or represents himself to be engaged in such business, and then being engaged in such business, or holding himself or representing himself to be engaged in such business, that he endeavors to use the post-office facilities to further

such business. It seems to me that if these two facts be established regarding any person or enterprise that such a person or enterprise should not be permitted to utilize the mails of the United States in order to promote such a business. I know there are many complaints about various publications that are well founded. They contain matter so offensive to decent men that they should not be transmitted through the mails. It would be impossible and improper to lay down a rule for legislation directed at a particular person or a particular publication. There should be established by law a general rule of conduct to be followed. There should be some authority reposed in some official to prevent the use of the facilities provided by the United States in its mails by anyone engaged in such business—

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). Or representing himself to be engaged in such business as is outlined in the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended a minute or two.

Mr. MANN. Make it five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a minute—and who attempts to utilize the mails to promote that business. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman quite sure the Postmaster General does not have authority now to eliminate such publications as the gentleman refers to in his amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I am not quite sure that he has not such authority. But the Postmaster General has been advised, and his report is based upon the opinion of the Solicitor for the Post Office Department. I believe the question as to just what power the Postmaster General now has is one about which lawyers may differ.

Mr. MOORE. He has the power to prevent the use of the mails for lottery purposes, for instance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The statute specifically prohibits the use of the mails for lottery purposes.

Mr. MOORE. And under the Barnhart amendment he has certain other powers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He has the power to exclude from the mails a publication upon the wrapper of which obscene or immoral or scurrilous matter is contained; but it has been held by the courts that the matter contained on the first page of a newspaper is not within the statute relating to marks or inscriptions upon the wrappers.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. How far would this proposed amendment extend with respect to magazines which present certain theories of government, and certain newspapers which print articles which are unquestionably scurrilous and perhaps libelous?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it would affect every publication which came within its definition. I have an interesting document—

Mr. MOORE. The theory is that it would cover all newspapers and magazines indulging the practices referred to?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would cover every publication which came within its terms. In 1908 President Roosevelt transmitted to the House by message an opinion of the then Attorney General of the United States relative to the exclusion from the mails of a publication issued in Paterson, N. J. The publication was an anarchistic publication that advocated murder, riot, and arson, and the killing of police officers, the seizing of armories, and the dynamiting of the armories if any difficulty were encountered in a proposed attempt to seize them. The President had addressed a communication to the Attorney General in which he said that by his direction the particular publication had been excluded from the mails and would not be admitted to the mails unless by order of court or unless the Attorney General advised him that it must be admitted. He submitted certain questions to the Attorney General, upon which he requested his opinion. I shall not undertake to recite the conclusions of the Attorney General; they are set forth fully in the opinion. I shall read, however, the last paragraph, which is as follows:

While, therefore, in the absence of any express provision of law or binding adjudication on this precise point, the question is certainly one of doubt and difficulty, I advise you that, in my opinion, the Postmaster General will be justified in excluding from the mails any issue of any periodical, otherwise entitled to the privileges of second-class mail matter, which shall contain any article constituting a seditious libel and encouraging such crimes as murder, arson, riot, and treason.

Mr. Chairman, there should not be uncertainty about the law. The use of the mails is a privilege, not a right. Whoever uses the mails should be able to ascertain definitely what the law prohibits from being transmitted and what may lawfully be sent through the mail. If a question is raised with the Post Office Department as to the character of a publication that can or can not be transmitted through the mails, the law should not be so uncertain or indefinite as to permit a legitimate controversy as to whether in the admission or exclusion of a publication there had been any abuse of authority. The Postmaster General is advised that there does not seem to be any law at present which covers obscene, indecent, defamatory, and scurrilous matter, unless the matter be of such character as to incite the imagination and lead to the doing of obscene acts. It is quite apparent, however, that there is a much larger class of material which should be excluded from the mails.

I realize, as all who have ever given any attention to the question, that the isolated or sporadic case can not be reached. No attempt is made to do so. But there are conditions that require no elaborate investigation nor extended discussion to convince decent men that they should not be permitted. Such conditions are covered by the pending amendment. If it be established to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General that a person is engaged or represents himself as engaged in the business of circulating publications or other matters of the character described in the amendment, and uses the mails to further such business, who will say that the mails should be used for so foul a purpose? No one need fear that the proposed amendment is overdrastic or unreasonable. It is almost identical with section 193 of the Canadian Postal Guide for 1913. There is just as much jealousy of the freedom of the press in Canada as here, but the freedom of the press so essential to a free people should never be confounded with an indecent license; nor under the plea of such freedom should it be permitted to debauch our mails by admitting publications of so outrageously indecent and offensive character as to arouse the resentment of decent men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposition contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is not in order where offered, and it is fairly objectionable from every standpoint. But he said something about the merits of it. We have a Postmaster General to-day. He is in office now. He will go out at some future time. Who will be there 5 years from now or 10 years from now we do not know. The power that is proposed to be lodged in the hands of the Postmaster General under that amendment should not be lodged in the hands of any one man in all this country. [Applause.] It should not be left to the decision of any one man, and he an executive officer and appointed by another man. So this proposed amendment, if you analyze it, means going back in a measure to the sedition laws, and we remember that the execution of those laws cost a great political party its existence.

Now, I am not in favor of scurrilous or obscene matter going through the mails. I am opposed to it, but I think when we legislate here for all the people of this country each and every individual should have redress somewhere, some place of appeal. Under that amendment an ipse dixit of whomever happens to be Postmaster General at the time is absolutely conclusive of what is and what is not objectionable under the proposed amendment. So, in my view there is law enough at present, and if the Postmaster General will exercise to the full his discretion in the premises as to what matter is scurrilous and libelous and tends to incite or create a disturbance of the peace or good order the law is ample. But assuming that it is not, yet here is a matter that affects free speech, so to speak, in this country. Free speech, to my mind, does not mean license, nor should it mean that to any fair-minded man. It does not mean license to abuse the law—not at all. But this proposed amendment, as proposed by the gentleman from New York, has not been considered or reported by any committee. It is a matter of the greatest importance. So the House should not be called upon to pass on a great question like this under the circumstances.

I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is useless to discuss it, Mr. Chairman, as the amendment is clearly subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the Chair will permit me, let me say to the gentleman from South Carolina that every power now possessed by the Postmaster General to exclude nonmailable

matter, or matter declared to be nonmailable, is a power that is exercised in his discretion, and there would be just as much right to a review in this case as there would be in any other case. The circulation of scurrilous, indecent, obscene, and defamatory matter in the mail is a gross abuse—

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. I will say to the gentleman, with all regard for him, that if he will introduce such a bill and come before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in this House he will have an ample hearing, and not only that, but if the committee sees fit to report it, it will do so promptly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that, Mr. Chairman. Of course I appreciate, and the gentleman from South Carolina appreciates, that even a favorable report upon such a bill at this session of Congress would mean no action. Here is an appropriation bill of 54 pages, with 24 pages of general legislation. Everyone here knows that if there is to be any postal legislation during this session it will have to be contained in this bill and in no other. The circulation of grossly obscene, indecent, scurrilous, and defamatory matter through the mails by whomever it may be circulated is a gross abuse of the privileges of the mails and should not be tolerated. There should be the power lodged some place to prevent such use—or abuse—of the mails. If it be not possessed now by the department it should be given to the department. The amendment which I proposed does not give any authority that anyone can justly criticize. It requires the establishment of two facts, first, that a person is either engaged, or holds himself out as engaged, in the circulation of matter of the offensive character described, and, secondly, is attempting to use the Post Office Department to further that business. I do not believe anyone can justify toleration of a situation that would permit a man to engage in such a business and use the Post Office facilities to promote it.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, we would like to go on with the bill, and I ask for the regular order.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. FINLEY. I will yield, of course.

Mr. FALCONER. I wanted to ask if it is not something of a dangerous precedent to establish to put this kind of an amendment or provision in a bill of this character, giving the Postmaster General the power when the common laws cover the point, and where anyone who now sends this kind of literature through the mails is subject to the penalties of the laws now on the statute books? I am against this amendment. I think it is un-American.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The law does not cover it, apparently. It is asserted that the literature or publication must be of such a character as to be not only obscene, but to incite a person to the perpetration of obscene acts. There is a great mass of literature of a grossly obscene and indecent character that should not be permitted to be transmitted through the mails which will not incite the perpetration of obscene acts.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, under what rule is the gentleman now proceeding?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent of the committee. If the gentleman makes the point of order—

Mr. TRIBBLE. I make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 20. That the act of March 4, 1909 (ch. 321, sec. 198, 35 Stat., p. 1126), be amended to read as follows:

"Whoever shall willfully or maliciously injure, tear down, or destroy any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or shall break open the same, or shall willfully or maliciously injure, deface, or destroy any mail deposited therein, or shall willfully take or steal such mail from or out of such letter box or other receptacle, or shall willfully aid or assist in any of the aforementioned offenses, shall for every such offense be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than three years."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 51, in line 2: After the word "same," insert "or shall deposit any circular or other printed matter not intended for the mails in the same."

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not subject to the point of order. It is dealing with the subject matter of the section. It should

have been put in in the committee. It was a question that the committee had agreed upon anyhow to report as a part of the section.

Mr. FINLEY. If the gentleman from Illinois will excuse me, I did not catch the full import of the amendment by the reading of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment again.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MADDEN. It simply prevents the littering up of the boxes. I ask for its adoption, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman if that amendment will apply to boxes in the rural districts, for instance, where men put circulars in the rural mail boxes?

Mr. MADDEN. If the matter is not intended for delivery through the mails, it would.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I think I would like just a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is recognized.

Mr. BRYAN. It is a common practice in the rural districts for a man to pass along the road and distribute circulars, for instance, which he wants the various farmers to get; and it is the practice for him to put those circulars in the rural mail boxes, and the farmer gets them. Candidates for Congress sometimes do that same thing in campaigning through the country. They go along a country road and put their cards and announcements in those boxes; and those boxes are owned by the people. If the gentleman refers to those boxes, I certainly think we ought to consider his amendment very carefully before adopting it.

Mr. MADDEN. The boxes are owned by the Government, or they are under the control of the Government, although they may be purchased by individuals; and they are United States mail boxes and subject to all the rules and regulations that govern the use of mail boxes, and nobody ought to be allowed to introduce any matter into any of those boxes that is not intended to go through the mails. If any person wants to communicate with people of a given territory, he ought to put his communication in an envelope and put a postage stamp upon it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that under a recent regulation of the Post Office Department people in towns and cities having free delivery are required to furnish a box if they wish to have their mail delivered.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman if such boxes are subject to the control of the Post Office Department, and whether the provision he suggests would affect the depositing in those boxes of some matter that was not deposited with the intention of going through the mails?

Mr. MADDEN. I think they are under the control of the Post Office Department, and it is a regulation of the department now that wherever new delivery service is extended in any city in the United States the owner of the house to which mail is to be delivered shall, in advance of the mail delivery, be required to put such a box in place. Now, that box ought not to be incumbered with all kinds of rubbish.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. There are deliveries, I will say to the gentlemen in rural service where newspapers deliver their daily issues; and would the gentleman have it so that they can not deposit those newspapers in those boxes that were put up for the purpose of receiving mail?

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose the gentleman has reference to county newspapers?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. They may be daily newspapers.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think that anything that is not permitted to go through the mails should be placed in any one of these boxes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentlemen have used all my time; but this amendment should not be adopted. I think we would make a mistake if we should adopt an amendment here that permits a fine of a thousand dollars to be imposed or a penalty of imprisonment inflicted if a person puts into a receptacle that is used for the purpose of receiving mail anything that is not intended to go through the post office.

It seems to me it would be absurd. In our cities we have our little boxes at our doors, and men passing along distributing circulars and newspapers deposit the circulars and newspapers in them. That is the very place to put them. They are

not designed to go through the mails at all. The boxes are ours. They are intended for the reception of mail and information; and it is right that those things should be put there.

In the country districts the boxes are put up along the roadway by the farmers and inhabitants of the rural districts for the convenience of the people, as receptacles for all kinds of information, for notices of farmers' grange meetings, and notices of church meetings, and all such notices are put in there so that the farmers and the people living in the houses can know what is going on and can be governed in their actions by the announcements. I think the gentleman's amendment goes entirely too far.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman would be willing to admit that the permission to put such matters in the boxes defeats the purpose of the department to collect postage for all mails?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe so at all. I do not believe that the class of information and pamphlets and circulars that I have referred to would go through the mail, although it may be possible that in some cases they would do that. But we are not running the Postal Service like a Chicago department store. We are not running this Post Office Department for the sake of making money out of it. We are running it for the purpose of disseminating information, and where information can be disseminated without a penny of cost to the Government we do not wish to derive any revenue from it. If that could be done all over the country, we would not have any post office; if the information could go out sufficiently without it, we would not have it. In all these offenses that are enumerated malicious intent is involved; yet by this amendment the putting of a notice of a grange meeting into a box, without malice of any kind, would be a crime, just the same as if a man should take an ax and cut down the box. I believe the gentleman from Illinois has a worthy purpose in view and has in mind the elimination of a real evil, but I believe this amendment is entirely wrong and entirely too far-reaching.

Mr. MADDEN. I believe that the gentleman would concede that if a man deliberately put into a box something that ought not to be there he would be doing it willfully?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; there is not much to the word "willfully" by itself; if, however, something in the nature of acid or ink or some disfiguring substance of that kind is put into a mail box for the purpose of destroying the contents, that would be willful and malicious, but to put notices and announcements of grange meetings and church meetings in boxes at the front doors of people, erected there by the resident for the reception of circulars and information, and in front of the houses of farmers in the rural districts, I do not believe it would be out of place, and I certainly am opposed to the passage of such an amendment as the gentleman has offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is one of the best-posted and one of the most industrious men on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. His judgment is usually correct. But in the case of this amendment I am persuaded, Mr. Chairman, that because of his surroundings in a great city where crimes are so often committed he is not fully in sympathy with the views, customs, and habits of the country cities and towns and the country itself. It is said that the post-office box belongs to the Government, and that the Government should have control over it. It is true that the Government ought to have control over the box in a sense, but I desire to inform my colleague that in the country, where there is rural mail delivery, the boxes are very often left entirely open for convenience, so that any matter of use and information may be deposited therein.

Mr. FINLEY. And they are owned by the patrons.

Mr. FOWLER. They are owned by the patrons, who have a vested interest in them which should not be taken away from them by any authority whatever. Indeed, I know of boxes in the country which have been left open until the birds have built nests in them; and if you are going to impose a fine upon the depositors in the box you will have to extend it to the birds; and who would want to fine those beautiful songsters which enliven the homestead of any man in the country? [Laughter and applause.] I am inclined to believe that if the gentleman had ever lived in the country he would withdraw his amendment and say to those people who are anxious to get any piece of information that they can that they have certain vested rights which ought not to be taken away from them.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. With pleasure.

Mr. HOWARD. Under the procedure proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] an English sparrow could not

get a fair and impartial trial in the country, and he is the bird that uses the mail boxes.

Mr. FOWLER. Gentlemen in the city are not used to these songsters as we are in the country. Of course, as I understand, the amendment does not propose to deal with that question. But, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness I think this amendment is too drastic, and I trust it will be defeated.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it may be that this proposition is a little hard upon the rural free-delivery boxes. I do not know. For years the Post Office Department has been endeavoring to compel people who live in the cities to provide receptacles for the mail, on the idea that it would hasten the work of delivering the mail. Many houses and apartments have little mail boxes at the entrance. People who engage in circular delivery in the cities have taken advantage of this situation, and in many places to-day, in the city of Chicago, and I doubt not elsewhere, it is impossible for the postman to put the mail in the mail box, because it is already filled up with circular matter put in by circular-distributing agencies. Now, there ought to be some way of preventing that. The people who own the boxes do not want circular matter. The circular agencies can distribute these circulars more cheaply by sending persons around with them than they can by sending them through the mails; and I have had, and I doubt not my colleagues and other Members from the cities have had, many protests from patrons, because it was impossible for them to have their mail put into the receptacles which they had prepared, because those receptacles were filled daily with so-called circular matter, sometimes almost printed books, put in by these distributing agencies. The Government will never succeed in getting the people of the cities completely to put in mail boxes until they protect those boxes for the use of the mail. Every once in a while the Post Office Department issues a statement that it will refuse to deliver mail in the city at any house where there is not a receptacle. I receive such a notice once in a while. I never had a receptacle except for a short time, and it became such a nuisance, from the circular matter, that I tore it out and threw it away, and I do not propose to put in one until there is some sort of protection. Of course, I know that the bluff about not delivering the mail does not go. It is a pure bluff. I am old enough to know better, and have had experience enough to know that the Government will not refuse to deliver the mail. When it goes to the trouble of paying a dollar to carry a letter to somebody in Alaska who has not a mail receptacle I am very sure it is not going to refuse to deliver the mail because the carrier does not want to ring the bell.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that in all cities there are a great many apartments that do not maintain a telephone system or have a clerk in charge, and as you enter the apartment building there is a mail box belonging to each of the apartments, and there is also a bell connected with each apartment? Callers ring the bell of the apartment desired and if the occupant is in he will answer the call by talking through a speaking tube. If no one is in the apartment, the caller usually deposits a card in the mail box or a note that he may wish to leave for the person he is calling upon. Would the gentleman say that ought to be prevented?

Mr. MANN. I doubt whether that ought to be prevented. Of course, it is true that the modern apartment building usually has these boxes. It is also true that there is a great protest now against the misuse of them.

Mr. BORLAND. I assume it is true in Chicago, as it is in most cities, that they have city ordinances governing the distribution of circular matter, and if it becomes a nuisance to distribute circulars in a certain way—for instance, if thrown on doorsteps or in hallways—the city can prevent it by ordinance; and the city could, by ordinance, prevent the distribution of circular matter to apartment houses in the way which has been stated.

Mr. MANN. A city can not by ordinance prevent the putting of this matter in the mail boxes. That question has been decided.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not think I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I do not care whether the gentleman agrees with me or not. It has been decided in our city that it could not be regulated in that way.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the distribution of circulars can be controlled by city ordinance, it makes no difference how they are distributed.

Mr. MANN. That is another thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by inserting at the end thereof the following: "where such boxes are located in the corporate limits of cities of 300,000 population or more."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to that because my city of Seattle contains a population of 310,000.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is simply this: I can readily realize that the use of mail boxes in large cities for the distribution of circular matter and the defeat of the collection of postage by the Government is probably greatly abused, but in the country districts and the smaller cities no such condition exists. Especially is this true in the country. I know that the rural delivery boxes are used by people in the country who never go near the post offices and who sometimes live 8 or 10 or 12 miles from the post office; they are used by school-teachers for the distribution of efficiency cards of scholars; and sometimes a farmer will send down by some friend for an article which is deposited in the mail box as a matter of convenience. The farmers erect these boxes at their own expense, and there is no abuse of this kind in the country. If this amendment were adopted, it would work a great inconvenience upon the rural element of our population. On the other hand, I believe that in the large cities it is abused. So far as the population of Seattle, which the gentleman says is 310,000, is concerned, I, of course, made the limit 300,000 as an arbitrary limit, but if the gentleman wants to amend it by making it 250,000, all right.

Mr. BRYAN. I should want to put it at 350,000 or 400,000, because Seattle will soon reach 400,000 anyway.

Mr. HOWARD. There may be a time when Seattle will dwindle to 200,000, so the gentleman had better put it down. But, Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of my amendment, and I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will not be adopted unless my amendment is adopted.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, there is no necessity for this distinction between cities of a certain size; in fact, there is no necessity for the amendment at all. It appears from the statement of the two gentlemen from Illinois that the only purpose of this amendment is to correct an abuse of the distribution of circular and advertising matter by private distributing companies in the city of Chicago. That matter can be controlled in cities by ordinance. The cities license the distributing companies, and can provide ordinances under which they can do business. They do not have to license these companies. The amendment would cut out in all cities of 300,000 and over what the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] spoke of—people going to call on some one in an apartment house where there is nothing but a small hallway with mail boxes with tenants' name on them. If you do not find the person you wish, you put a card in the box and perhaps a message. That is done commonly in every city, and this proposed amendment would cut that out.

Mr. HOWARD. I think the gentleman is mistaken; it does not affect that class of matter; it says "circular matter." If the gentleman will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, he will see that that is a fact.

Mr. BORLAND. The circular matter can be easily controlled by a local ordinance, and no amendment is necessary for that.

Mr. HOWARD. They would have to engage in the business of distributing circulars. You could hire a small boy to distribute the circulars.

Mr. BORLAND. There could be no great evil growing out of the distribution of circulars by a small boy.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know this amendment does not come with any recommendation from the Post Office Committee.

Mr. BORLAND. The whole amendment ought to be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to change the figures in his amendment?

Mr. HOWARD. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 21. That section 3938 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"All letters of domestic origin which can not be delivered by postmasters shall be sent to the Post Office Department, and such as contain inclosures of value, other than correspondence, shall be recorded. If the sender or addressee can not be identified, such letters shall be held for a period of one year awaiting reclamation. If within one year they have not been claimed, they shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General may direct.

"All other undeliverable letters shall be disposed of without record and not held for reclamation."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information from the chairman of the committee with reference to this section. Section 3938 of the Revised Statutes seems to have been entirely rewritten in this bill. From the report of the Assistant Postmaster General the purpose seems to have been to cut the period of holding certain dead letters from four years to one year.

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask what was the purpose in rewriting the section in the manner in which it has been written?

Mr. MOON. I do not know that I could tell the gentleman that there is any purpose except to put it in better shape. The purpose, the gentleman will understand, of changing from one year to four years is to prevent the vast accumulation of this matter. Much of the matter is valueless after a year, if not all of it, and it was thought best by the department to dispose of all of this matter promptly.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that what I have in mind particularly is the first two lines:

All letters of domestic origin which can not be delivered by postmasters shall be sent to the Post Office Department.

The next section in the statute provides that where letters can not be delivered, if there is a return card upon the envelope, they shall be sent to the addressee. My query is whether the language—

All letters * * * which can not be delivered must be sent to the Post Office Department—is in conflict with the present language of the next section of the statute?

Mr. MOON. I think where the addressee can be reached it will be sent to him.

Mr. LENROOT. Is that a delivery?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. That is the only question I had in mind.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 23. That on and after July 1, 1915, the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a standard route of 24 miles and over, six days in the week, shall be \$1,200 per annum, payable monthly; on routes 22 miles and less than 24 miles, \$1,152; on routes 20 miles and less than 22 miles, \$1,080; on routes 18 miles and less than 20 miles, \$960; on routes 16 miles and less than 18 miles, \$840; on routes 14 miles and less than 16 miles, \$720; on routes 12 miles and less than 14 miles, \$672; on routes 10 miles and less than 12 miles, \$624; on routes 8 miles and less than 10 miles, \$576; on routes 6 miles and less than 8 miles, \$528; on routes 4 miles and less than 6 miles, \$480. A rural letter carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half the length of the route served by him, and a carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half of the combined length of the two routes: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length may be fixed at not exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "each," in line 9, page 52, and add the letter "s" to the word "carrier," in line 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 52, in line 9, by striking out the word "each" and adding the letter "s" to the word "carrier."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, this section involves very largely a section that was incorporated in the last Post Office appropriation bill. At the time the last section increasing the salaries of the rural-route carriers was incorporated in the Post Office appropriation bill there was no demand for it at all on the part of the Post Office Department. In fact, the Postmaster General before our committee explicitly made the statement that while none of his employees, he believed, were overpaid, yet he believed they were all paid sufficiently high salaries, and he made no demand or any request whatever for any increase of salary.

Congress, however, in its wisdom or unwisdom—and I shall not undertake to say which—increased the salaries of the rural route carriers \$100 per year. At that time there were approximately 43,325 rural route carriers in the United States, and that necessitated an appropriation of \$4,325,000 to comply with

the law passed by Congress. But in the readjustment of the salaries of the rural route carriers, which took place on the 1st of last July, the Post Office Department took into consideration certain additional equations that prior to that time had not been taken into consideration in fixing the salaries of the rural route carriers. Prior to the 30th day of last June the distance alone was the controlling consideration which governed the salary of the rural route carrier, 24 miles being fixed as the standard route; but when the Post Office Department on the 1st of last July undertook a reclassification of the salaries of the rural route carriers and to apportion the extra \$100 per year which Congress sought to give them it added two more elements, the weight and distance of the routes. It is true that the Post Office Department did not consume all of the \$4,325,000 which would have been necessary to carry out the express will of Congress, but in the reclassification it did add approximately \$1,871,000. In other words, in order to carry out the idea of the reclassification, the Post Office Department took \$1,871,000 of the \$4,325,000 which Congress had appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. HOWARD. Did it not also add length of time, making it weight, time, and distance in the reapportionment?

Mr. COX. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I thought there might be some question as to whether or not the Postmaster General had the power under the law to make that additional classification. On August 7, 1914, I addressed a letter to the Post Office Department with a view of seeing whether or not, under the law that was in force on the 1st of July last, the department had the power to take into consideration these other elements in the reclassification of the salaries of the rural route carriers. I shall not take the time to read all of the letter, but quote just this portion of it:

I beg to inform you that the act of April 21, 1902 (ch. 563, 32 Stats., 113), provides that the Postmaster General is authorized to classify the Rural Delivery Service and fix the compensation of employees in such service.

The Post Office Department or the Solicitor of the Post Office Department, at the request of the Postmaster General, replied that under the law which I have just read the Post Office Department had a clear right to reclassify the salaries on the 1st of last July, taking into consideration these two other elements that have never been taken into consideration by the Post Office Department prior to this readjustment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Members of the House whether or not it is right to absolutely undo everything that the Postmaster General has done, which will be done if the word "each" remains in the bill, because that fixes positively and definitely, in my mind, an increase of salary of \$100 per year to each rural-route carrier in the United States? Before this work was undertaken by the Post Office Department exhaustive inquiries were inaugurated by the department with a view of seeing how much mail was carried by the rural-route carriers in different sections of the United States. It was found, and found indisputably to be true, that in many, many sections of this country the average weight of mail per day did not exceed 15 pounds.

In many, many sections of this country the average weight of mails carried per day by the rural-route carrier was less than 15 pounds. In many sections of the country it ranged all the way from 15 pounds up to 150 pounds per day, while, again, in many sections of the country, particularly in the West, Northwest, and up in the New England section, they carry from 4,000 to 5,000, 6,000, and 7,000 pounds per day, and yet they carried it at the same wage that the rural-route carrier got who only carried from 5 to 10 pounds per day. I believe this ought to be apportioned along the line of the amount of work that is done by the rural-route carrier, and I do believe that the Post Office Department in its reclassification has done equal and exact justice to all the rural-route carriers.

Mr. HOWARD. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. COX. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOWARD. Does not the gentleman think distance ought to be the standard of measurement upon which the salaries of the rural carriers should be fixed?

Mr. COX. No; I do not. I think other elements ought to enter into it.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman state why that should not be the standard of measurement of the pay?

Mr. COX. Because if distance alone is to control, a man might by the use of a motor cycle travel 30 miles much easier and much quicker and much faster than a man would be able to travel the same distance who drove a buggy or used a two-horse wagon to haul that load.

Mr. HOWARD. Does not that fall upon the carrier himself who has got \$270 invested in a motor cycle, whereas he would have only \$70, \$80, or \$100 invested in a horse?

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. For a question.

Mr. BORLAND. I wish to ask the gentleman for information. Was I correct in understanding the gentleman to say that some carriers carried 6,000 to 7,000 pounds?

Mr. COX. They do.

Mr. BORLAND. A day?

Mr. COX. They do.

Mr. BORLAND. By what sort of a process do they carry it?

Mr. COX. I do not know; but that is exactly what the investigation disclosed that was put on foot by the Postmaster General.

Mr. BORLAND. There is a vast difference in the amount carried by different carriers?

Mr. COX. Surely.

Mr. BORLAND. Some carry as low as 15 pounds and some carry as high as 5,000, 6,000 and 7,000 pounds?

Mr. COX. That is true. Some of the extreme routes in the northwest and in the northeast parts of the country carry from 4,000 to 6,000 pounds and only get about \$1,100 for their entire work.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hope this amendment will not pass if the amendment has the effect which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] says it will have. I have always believed that the distance traveled by the carrier was the true basis upon which to fix salaries. Now, it seems that the Postmaster General disagrees with Congress upon this method of fixing salaries, and has added three other requirements for the carrier to fulfill before receiving the maximum pay provided for the carrier in the last Post Office appropriation bill, to wit, weight, number of pieces handled, and number of hours consumed in covering the route. Now, here is the thing we must not lose sight of, and it is very important to a man who is actually carrying mail on a route. For instance, suppose a rural carrier had only two pieces of mail and one of those pieces of mail was for a patron at the first box on his route and the other piece of mail was for the patron at the last box on the route and he had a 24-mile route. It would necessitate that carrier making that entire trip. Why? Because of the fact he is supposed to take up the mail deposited in the boxes and bring that in, and he is supposed to deliver the mail on that route.

Mr. RUCKER. And suppose he had none?

Mr. HOWARD. And suppose he had none, as suggested by my friend from Missouri. If he had not a single piece, he would have to go over that 24-mile route six days in the week. Now, it is easy to sit up here in Congress and talk about rural carriers being overpaid. I believe they are getting now a fair rate of compensation. I believe the carriers will be satisfied if they actually receive the compensation Congress voted them. I believe they are going to remain satisfied for some years to come, because the pay as now fixed is about what it ought to be, but when you take into consideration the monotony of the work, the covering every day of the same distance under changing conditions—rain, cold, snow, frozen and very bad roads—I think that distance ought to be the basis of pay, because it does not make any difference with a fellow when he is on the route as to whether he delivers 150 or 250 or 500 pieces of mail if he is on it.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I will.

Mr. LLOYD. Does the gentleman mean to say that the rural carriers now are satisfied with the present interpretation of the law?

Mr. HOWARD. No; I did not mean to say that. What I meant was—

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the rural carriers were satisfied with their present pay.

Mr. HOWARD. That this law as now drawn, and as it will be if this word "each" is not stricken out, will be satisfactory; then that makes it mandatory upon the Postmaster General to pay them the salary we voted them in the last Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman states the rural carrier was satisfied. Of course he is not satisfied and has not been satisfied since the 1st day of July.

Mr. HOWARD. I meant this, if I did not make it clear: If the salaries of the mail carriers are predicated upon the law

as it was intended by Congress when it passed legislation last year that each carrier should receive this additional \$100.

Mr. BORLAND. Assuming that there is a difference of from 15 pounds to 7,000 pounds in the amount that is carried daily by different carriers, does the gentleman undertake to say that difference ought not to be taken into consideration at all in the fixing of the pay?

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, yes; I think that difference ought to be taken into consideration by increasing—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD. In an isolated case, like my friend from Missouri has mentioned, I think it ought to be taken into consideration. I do not believe there is any rural carrier in the United States who is carrying, on the average, 7,000 pounds of mail a day. I think that is a dream that some inspector in the Post Office Department has had.

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose it ran from 10 pounds to 1,000 pounds?

Mr. HOWARD. That should increase the wages of the man who was carrying the 1,000 pounds and let the wages of the man who was carrying 10 pounds remain the same. Or abolish the 10-pound route. These routes are patronized or they would not have been established. And so, when you go to taking in the time element and piece element, and go around and undertake to predicate the carrier's salary on that, you will continue to keep him up in the air as to what he is going to receive. And there is one common-sense principle upon which to predicate it, and that is the distance and the time it takes that man to travel that route. Now, they say he employs an automobile. If he does, he has probably \$500 or \$1,000 invested in it. That is his investment and not the Government's. If he drives a slow horse, that is his misfortune; if he drives a fast horse, that is his good fortune. The carrier is the man that bears the brunt of the expense incident to the operation of his route. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that this particular word ought not to be stricken from the bill. It ought to be plain and unmistakable that the Government intended that these rural carriers have this \$100 increase. And no man, be he Postmaster General or anybody else, ever should have the right to vary the intention of Congress and divert a fund that we have appropriated for a certain class of our employees and withhold it from them when we have said that they should have it.

It is threatened by some that if we allow fair compensation for rural carriers the service will be placed on a contract basis. Let me, in conclusion, sound a word of warning, be you Democrat or Republican: Woe unto the political life of him who destroys the efficiency of the farmers' mail service. [Applause.] That is all I have to say about it.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to oppose the passage of this section of the bill, but to make some observations that I offer to the House and to the committee for whatever they are worth. I have always been very friendly to this service. I believe the country people are entitled to it and that it ought to be maintained. I believe I was on the committee when, by a single vote, in the experimental stage of this service, the amount was raised from \$350,000 to \$750,000, and I have voted for the increase until it has reached the amount that it is to-day. But there is an end to all things, and there ought to be an end to the depletion of the Federal Treasury in the interest of any class of officials. That these men are getting now that to which they are entitled I have not the slightest doubt. But, as I remarked, I am not going, in view of the fact that I know that the southern carriers in the Southern States form a great part of the Democratic political machine in that section and in the Northern States form a great part of the political Republican machine, to let it change my opinion. I know it is very hard to run against one machine, but when you confront two you are in very great trouble.

I want to make this suggestion: This great service, this valuable service, a service that ought to be continued and not impaired, is now losing to the people of the United States, if I recollect aright, about \$39,000,000 of money per annum. In other words, if it were not performed we would save that much. Or, again, the benefits that come from it, so far as revenue is concerned—and of course that is not all the benefit as compared with the actual cost—produce a deficit of \$39,000,000. The department has said to you, and says in this very report, that if you are willing to let the department contract for this service instead of having it performed by carriers who hold their office for life at a fixed salary, they can obtain at every office in the

United States men who will perform the service as well and will give to the country as efficient service in every way as possible can be had for a much less sum of money than you are now paying. In other words, they present to this Democratic House, standing upon a platform demanding economy and reform, a proposition that if you will permit them to contract this service they guarantee to you a saving of from \$18,000,000 to \$20,000,000 on this item every year.

I am not going into the discussion of the wisdom of the contract service as against the other service. I am not making observations to attempt to influence anybody on this side, but I want you to vote with your eyes wide open on this question, because you do not know what is coming after a while.

Another thing, you are taking away, if you pass this section without the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana being incorporated, the discretion we place upon the Postmaster General now on the question of salaries, a wise discretion that has never been taken from any Postmaster General heretofore.

You say that every route of 24 miles shall receive a compensation of \$1,200. You speak in figures as to the shorter route, on down the scale. Now, let us stop and think about that for one minute. I do not care whether you are anxious to serve your carriers, your country, or yourselves—anyway you want to put it—and I am not censuring you about your position at all, but give you full credit in your desire to perform your service as you think best—but take it from any view that you want, and I submit to you as a common-sense proposition, one that a wayfaring man, though a fool, can see the point of, that if a man on a 24-mile route over a good road, who has 3 pounds of mail to carry on a bicycle or automobile, and can perform that service in three to six hours, ought he to be paid as much for the service performed on that route as the man who has to travel in a wagon over bad roads and be out 12 to 15—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MOON (continuing). Be out in the weather 12 to 14 hours, and carry from 2,000 to 4,000 pounds a day? Now, any sensible man knows if you give those two men the same compensation that it is not just, that it is not fair. Therefore it follows that if you are going to determine a compensation for a carrier that is just, you must take into consideration the elements that affect the service; that is, the number of packages that he has to handle and the weight of those packages. Why? Because while it may take one man practically the same length of time to travel the route as the other, he has got to handle packages that the other does not handle. They are more or less heavy and more or less numerous, and the time consumed is very much greater by one than the time consumed by the other. I suggest to you that you do not tie the hands of the Postmaster General along that line. It is not a wise thing to do.

I am not going to vote against this section. As chairman of the committee, it is proper for me to state these facts. I do not care what you do about it. I am going to tell you as I did about the assistant postmasters. I am going to prophesy again, that if you do this, if you destroy this discretion of the Post Office Department, you take away the only protection the people have against the plunder of the Treasury along this line. The power that exists in the department under the general law will be sufficient to wipe out and put under the contract system more than half of the postal routes in the United States if they want to exercise that power, which I hope the necessity may not arise to do. I am opposed to it. I want to retain the carriers. I want to retain the routes. I want to give just compensation. I want the country people to have the benefit of it. But if it is to come down to a question of plundering the Treasury of my country and turning over its revenues to men who do not perform service commensurate with value received, if it comes to the point where the judgment of the department must be overridden in the interest of any class of officials, then I want to say that I believe if the power exists under the law and the Constitution, the department ought to exercise it—and I do believe it—to discontinue these routes, in part, and establish the old post office again, and make it nonaccounting, so that practically it will be of no cost to the Government, and enlarge the power of the star-route carrier so as to give him, in effect, some of the powers and duties of the rural carrier. Then the service can be performed perhaps as well as now.

I want to impress upon you the fact that I am not going to oppose this section. I am not going to make any objection to

it. I know you are head bent—I might use another word with propriety—on passing this section. I know you are. But, as one who wants to preserve the rural routes, as one who has been interested in them from the very beginning of the experimental stage, and as one who believes it would be better to continue this service as it is than to discontinue it, I want to say to you that the Government and people can not afford to assent to the passage of such laws, because it will not be justified.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. Does the gentleman prognosticate that if the Cox amendment is not passed, in a few months or years the Rural Delivery System will be under contract?

Mr. MOON. No; I think if you continue to pass provisions of this sort the Government will be forced, under the power it has now, to abandon a lot of these routes, which will put you back to the star routes, which I would regret very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, let us understand exactly what is the force and effect of this amendment if adopted. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], the author of the amendment, and the chairman of the committee [Mr. Moon] both say that the effect of it will be to continue present conditions. If this amendment is defeated, then, instead of having the conditions as they exist at the present time throughout the United States, of which the people as well as the carriers are complaining, they will be prevented.

The proponent of the amendment [Mr. Cox] said that by reason of the fact that the will of Congress in making the appropriation at the last session of Congress was not carried out a saving of something like \$3,000,000 was made possible, as that amount was not used. Congress appropriated so much to carry out a certain specific and well-defined purpose, and that purpose was to increase the salaries of the rural carriers in this country on standard routes \$100 per annum, and upon routes of shorter length a proportionate amount. It was not only intended that that should be done, but Congress appropriated the identical sum of money necessary to carry out that intention and purpose. The Postmaster General, under rules and regulations which he promulgated and adopted in the Post Office Department, prevented the increase of \$100 per annum by taking into consideration other matters, to wit, distance, and the weight and number of packages which the rural-delivery carrier carried along his route, and the time necessary for him to perform the service.

Now, then, the question with you, my friends, the question with us all, is whether or not we shall have the intention and purpose of Congress carried out; whether our intention and purpose shall be adopted and shall be executed, or whether the construction of the Post Office Department shall prevail over the intention and purpose of Congress, which is well known by every Member on this floor.

Now, then, the chairman of the Committee says that it is dangerous to take away this discretionary power from the Postmaster General and fix these salaries ourselves. Is it more dangerous to take it away from him than it is to take it away from the Representatives of the American people upon the floor of this House, who are charged with the enactment of the laws, and charged with the expenditure of the public funds, and charged with the responsibilities that rest upon them for the exercise of which they must go back to the people and be held responsible by them for whatsoever they do here? [Applause.]

Shall we have the purpose and intention of the people, expressed through their Representatives, carried out, or is it more dangerous to take away from the people, through their Representatives assembled on the floor of this House, that power and vest it in any department? I prefer to trust the people and put the responsibility on the Representatives of the people, and when they speak and enact laws and put them upon the statute book and appropriate the money to carry out the execution of those laws the money should be expended for that purpose and the Representatives be held responsible who vote the appropriation.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MOON. It is not a question of trusting the Representatives of the people or trusting the department. The department is as much a representative of the people as we are. The point is this, that if you are going to leave the law on the

subject as it now stands and then make these changes here, you will have to repeal the whole law to destroy the power of the Postmaster General over the control of the rural routes, because this section does not affect that in any way. It only affects the carrier. He has the power now. You are not attempting to take away from him the power to control the routes. If you want to tie the hands of the Postmaster General completely and prevent anything being done except to increase the pay of the carriers before every election comes along—

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Oh, we are not doing that—

Mr. MOON. You have got to do this: Not only take away from him all the power he has over rural carriers but over rural routes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Nobody wants to take away from the Postmaster General the power he has over his department or any part of it. No one on the floor of this House would do that. I have the greatest admiration and very highest regard for the Postmaster General. He is my strong personal friend, and I am his friend and he knows I am. I have known him many years, served here in this House with him, and I have the greatest confidence in his honesty and in his integrity and in the purity of his purposes and actions, so far as that is concerned, and he is giving the country a great business administration, for all of which I heartily commend him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I ask leave to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps the gentleman can throw a little light on this language.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds, I will ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and upon the section close in 20 minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield five minutes to me?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close at the expiration of 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I object.

Mr. FINLEY. I suggest that the gentleman make it 25 or 30 minutes. There are several gentlemen who wish to be heard.

Mr. MOON. I have no objection to giving Members all the time they want. If they want 30 minutes, let them say so; but the time for debate on this proposition has already expired under the rule. I am just proposing to extend it. If Members want 30 minutes, all right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I should like five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MOON. That the debate be extended 30 minutes on this section and amendments thereto, and that the Chair control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have an amendment or so that I want to offer, in addition to this amendment which is now pending. If the 30 minutes are exhausted in debate on this amendment, then there will be no debate on other amendments. If you limit the time only on this amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. MOON. I do not suppose you want 30 minutes on this amendment?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No.

Mr. MOON. It is 20 minutes after 1 o'clock, and I will amend my request so as to require a vote on amendments to this section at 2 o'clock. That will give all the friends of the rural-route carriers a chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee state his request again?

Mr. MOON. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Let the Chair control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will control the time. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to propound a question to the gentleman from Mississippi. The language of this section as it now stands reads as follows:

That on and after July 1, 1915, the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a standard route of 24 miles and over, six days in the week, shall be \$1,200 per annum.

Under the amendment as proposed it would read as follows:

That on and after July 1, 1915, the compensation of rural letter carriers for serving a standard route of 24 miles and over, six days in the week, shall be \$1,200 per annum.

I should like to know what is the difference in the meaning and what change is made by striking out the word "each" and making the word "carrier" plural instead of singular. If the gentleman can throw some light on that, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. As was stated by the gentleman who offered the amendment, and also as stated by the chairman of the committee himself, the purpose and effect of it would be to permit the continuance of present conditions and the enforcement of such other rules and regulations as might be adopted in the future to fix the salaries of rural carriers.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am frank to say that I can not see where the striking out of the word "each" and the making of the word "carrier" plural gives any discretion to anybody.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. We did not see the change in the old language when we put it in the last bill, in the identical language in which it was the year before, but still by rules and regulations the effect of that language as before construed was nullified and the purpose of Congress was not carried out. These gentlemen who stand behind the scenes, and who know what is occurring, and who have the information from the Post Office Department which we do not have, information which is given in the hearings before the committee, know the force and effect of the language which they offer on the floor of this House, or they would not be offering it. And as I stated a moment ago, the gentleman who offered the amendment stated that that was the purpose and object of it, and the chairman of the committee said the same thing. Hence he believes, and the committee believes, that it will have that effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman's own construction of his amendment be true, then the compensation of rural letter carriers for standard routes of 24 miles and over would not be \$1,200 per annum.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It might not be, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Post Office Department, and we know it is not now under existing rules and regulations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. That is the construction the gentleman from Indiana places on his own amendment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes. Under this language as it stands in the bill, with probably one amendment, there would be no question and no doubt in the world but what each and every rural-delivery carrier in the United States who travels 24 miles or more would get the \$1,200. Therefore it is better to make it specific and definite, so there will be no doubt about it, than to put in words that would destroy the specific and definite purpose that we desire to express.

There is another thing I want to call your attention to, and that is the word "standard." If you leave the word "standard" in here, in my judgment the Post Office Department may prescribe what is a standard route of 24 miles by saying that a standard route of 24 miles shall consist of a route where the carrier travels 24 miles and carries so much weight and so many pieces of mail and takes so much time to do it. Hence I say that the word "standard" ought to be stricken out, and instead of saying "standard" route say "rural" route of 24 miles in length, in order that we may ourselves define a "standard route," and not leave it to the construction of some officer to whom the power of execution is delegated. Therefore I protest against the pending amendment, and hope you will vote it down. I will offer an amendment later to strike out the word "standard" and insert the word "rural," in line 10, page 52, and if that amendment is adopted, then the bill will read "the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a rural route of 24 miles and over, six days in the week, shall be \$1,200 per annum, payable monthly." That will make it definite and specific and relieve it of every doubt. Let us vote down this amendment, and then strike out "standard" and insert "rural," and the carriers will then receive \$1,200 beyond question, as there will be left no occasion for construction or adoption of rules and regulations for it will be the law beyond a doubt. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the bill by striking out the word "standard" in line 10, page 52.

Mr. COX. To that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in that connection I desire to say that under the present law carriers who deliver the mail about the cities are paid \$100 a month. These carriers not only do not furnish their own transportation but instead have it furnished for them at the expense of the Government. We see the carriers going about the cities with automobiles and with horses and wagons furnished them by the Government. Not only do we see that, but we see carriers in the cities furnished with street-car tickets when on their rounds collecting and delivering the mail in cities.

But when it comes to the rural service, the carriers are paid less than the city carriers and are required, on long routes, to keep two or three horses; and, in addition to that, are required to furnish their own wagons. In my judgment, it is a matter which resolves itself down to the fact that the city carriers are either paid too much or the rural carriers are paid too little. I do not say that the city carriers are paid too much, because the question arises in these times of the high cost of living whether or not a man can support his family upon less than \$100 a month. Consequently, I have no fight to make on that proposition, but I do insist, and I think my position is right beyond all sort of question, that the rural carrier who receives \$1,100 for the 20 or 25 mile route, and that route extending over muddy roads, where he has to change horses every other day, is not sufficiently compensated for it.

I wish to strike out the word "standard" so there can be no sort of question as to what the right of the carrier will be, so that a Postmaster General or nobody else can juggle with that word "standard" and decide that it means that he can fix the salary for the route notwithstanding.

I want to commit myself unquestionably to the policy of paying these rural-route carriers more, because they have to furnish their horses and wagons. I believe it ought to be done and I believe it will be done. [Applause.]

I, for one, shall always be found endeavoring to preserve the efficiency of the rural service.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall only detain the committee a moment. I usually rely on the committee and vote with the committee, and I intend to do so in the future; but to strike out the word "each" will again put this rural-carrier salary matter into the House to be battled hither and thither as a political football, and no one wants to do that. I think \$1,200 is enough for a rural carrier—all he ought to get—that he ought to get that, and that we ought to stop right there. So long as you leave any question or doubt as to what the department is going to give them, we will have this trouble every time that the appropriation bill comes up. A year ago Congress, at the end of a long debate, intended to give the rural carriers \$100 a month. They are not all getting it. By the construction placed there by the Post Office Department they have not got it. As the bill is written, and as I understand it, the proposition in the Post Office appropriation bill as it now stands in the bill gives them that. Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] moves to strike out the word "each" and throw it again into doubt. I do not think it is good policy; I do not think it is good economy; I do not think it is what the bulk of this House, on both sides of the aisle, desires to do. I believe the great majority of both the Democrats and the Republicans believe that \$1,200 a year is not giving too much pay to the rural-carrier service. I believe that they will practically all vote for it when they understand it. They voted for it a year ago, and they will vote for it now. In conversation a moment ago with a member of the committee he said, "If you strike out the word 'each' you will give the Postmaster General the authority to reconstruct it and to give what he thinks they ought to have." Now, I do not reflect on the Postmaster General. I am more fond of him than of any other Democratic departmental official. I think he is making good; I think he will go down in history as one of the greatest Postmasters General we ever had. I think this is the only fly in the ointment in his administration—that he wants to keep tinkering and tampering with this service—and I do not think Congress is in sympathy with him. I think any time when we can have a square-toed vote, where Members understand the situation, they will vote to give the carriers this amount.

It is the most appreciated service of any Government service. It is the one service that really reaches the rural community.

Of course the Postmaster General is making good. Of course he is trying to save money; but the people do not want him to stint or even run the risk by stinting of crippling this service.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, but I do not know of any service that reaches so great a body of the people as the Rural Free Delivery Service. There seems to be an effort here—and I do not know that anyone is opposed to the system at all to largely cripple this feature of the Postal Service—and there has been a hue and cry raised here to economize along this line.

Now, I think that might be false economy. I do not think the Post Office Department should be put on a paying basis if thereby you are impairing the service in that department. The Army and the Navy are not self-sustaining propositions. We spend about \$250,000,000 for the maintenance of a great Army and a great Navy, and if the times portend anything—if certain militarists have their way—we may double that amount in the near future. Nobody contends that the Army or the Navy should be put on a self-sustaining basis. The courts of the country are not a self-sustaining proposition. The Federal courts are not a self-sustaining proposition, and neither are the circuit courts of our respective States self-sustaining propositions.

But we hear it everywhere said that we can save a few million dollars a year by abolishing the rural free delivery as it now obtains if we place the same upon a contract basis. The people do not want the Post Office Department put on a contract basis again; they do not want the old star route to be once more brought into vogue, or the rural mail service either overturned or impaired. If the rural people see one thing more than another in the way of the Government coming to their immediate relief, it is the fact that the rural free delivery route reaches into every nook and corner of the Government where it has been inaugurated. To them that is something visible, to them that is something tangible. They can take that and seize upon it and appreciate it. They get their mail every day, and they can send to the town or the city and exchange the products of their farm for the goods they may buy from the merchants. I know that the Post Office Department down here is a friend of the rural carrier, and, with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], we are all very fond of the Postmaster General. I do know that he would not destroy the rural route service of the country nor lessen its efficiency, nor do I believe that any Member on this floor would overturn and subvert that great system, but if you want to raise a protest, so to speak, with the great rural population of this country, then abolish the great service they now have and put the same on a contract basis. We hear no contention made that the letter carriers of the city should be placed on a contract basis. Why make a discrimination between the rural-route carrier and the city carrier, who has no investment, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] a moment ago demonstrated?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman knows that there is not anything at all in this bill that proposes to put the rural-route carrier service on a contract basis.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. There is this experimental scheme.

Mr. COX. Oh, no. That went out on a point of order made by the chairman of this committee.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It went out on a point of order, but the chairman of the committee discussed it a while ago.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I know it went out on a point of order, but I will say this, that the proponents of this bill, the members of that committee, are largely in favor of subverting and overturning the present system and putting the same on a contract basis. I believe that was recommended by the Postmaster General, for whom I have the highest regard.

Mr. WINGO. Is it not true that within less than an hour it has been urged by the chairman of the committee that if we do not adopt this amendment the Postmaster General will exercise his authority under the law and put at least half of these routes on the contract system?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. My colleague is correct in the main, as I understand it. I heard the statement of the chairman a few moments ago. Mr. Chairman, it seems that whenever a little money dribbles out into the great rural communities of the country, and the country boys pick up a few extra shekles here and there, we then begin at once to want to economize, but we hear nothing about the other contractors and the other officeholders, whose sums in the way of compensation are fabulous as compared to that of the rural carrier. We do not raise our voice in protest against those things at all, but

we say that because, forsooth, two or three or maybe five million dollars of money may be saved which now goes to the rural carriers it should be done, although we may impair the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to take issue with the great committee which reported this bill or with any member of that committee.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman is not taking issue with the committee. We put it in.

Mr. RUCKER. I know they are sincere in their purpose and have as much interest in the general welfare of the country as those of us who differ from them in some respects. Referring now to the suggestion just made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] in respect to the statement made by a member of the committee a few moments ago to the effect that unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], one of the members of the committee, should be adopted, thereby giving certain wanted latitude, license, power, or privilege to the department, that the department would perhaps exercise the power conferred on it by law to annihilate the Rural Delivery Service, all I have to say is that the assertion is astounding. The Postmaster General is a gentleman for whom we all entertain the highest regard; was recently one of our colleagues here, trusted and followed; and as Postmaster General has no vestige of power except that given to him by Congress, unless it is obtained or taken by usurpation. I can not believe and I will not give credence to the threat implied in the language of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moxx] that the Postmaster General of this great Republic would so far forget his duty to the American people as to become vexed and piqued because the Representatives of the people see fit to do certain things, and that, therefore, in retaliation for that which he thinks we ought not to have done, he will blast the hopes, aspirations, and happiness of hundreds of thousands of American citizens. I do not believe he will do it. I say to you it sounds the death knell of Democratic Postmasters General whenever he puts the ax to the roots of the rural delivery tree in this country. [Applause.]

The people pay the expense, the people demand this service, and I tell you the time will come when every man, if he does not know it now, will know that the people are mighty and that in the end they must and will prevail. This Congress sought a year or more ago, whether rightfully or wrongfully, whether wisely or unwisely, to fix the compensation of rural carriers at twelve hundred dollars for every route of 24 miles or more, but by some combination of figures and facts, in some cases where the pay had been eleven hundred dollars, it was increased, not \$100, as Congress provided, but \$4 a year, and in one case \$1 a year. Gentlemen, it will not do. Every time this question comes up gentlemen talk about economizing in the Postal Service, which affects the great body of the American people. Grant that we can save some money, grant that it would be more economical in this country to have the farmer cease following his plow and wend his way to the post office somewhere to obtain his mail. The people in the country are entitled to this service as much as the people in the great cities are entitled to it, and I am making no warfare on those who live in the cities. Is the salary at twelve hundred dollars too much? Who says it is? I grant that it is unequal. I readily concede that if twelve hundred dollars is an adequate and fair compensation to the man who carries 25 pounds, then twelve hundred dollars would be wholly inadequate compensation for the man who carries daily, or even some days, 7,000 pounds, as the distinguished member of this committee said, though I am quite sure that he was mistaken.

Mr. COX. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I was not.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman is certain about that, the query in my mind is why some enterprising man does not establish a railroad to haul this immense traffic around.

Mr. COX. If I am mistaken about it, my mistake originated in the Post Office Department, because that is the result of their investigation.

Mr. RUCKER. I heard a gentleman yesterday read some figures that looked like somebody in the Post Office Department had made a mistake.

Mr. COX. I have in my hand a tabulated statement of 500 or 1,000 post offices.

Mr. RUCKER. I concede that. But will anybody say that \$1,200 is adequate compensation to pay for the service of carrying the mail on a 24-mile route, where he must sometimes carry 7,000 pounds a day, enough freight to make three good two-horse wagonloads?

Mr. COX. No; it is not; he gets more.

Mr. RUCKER. The time will come when such a case must be taken care of and he must be paid more. Now, the question is, Is \$1,200 too much for an average route? I say no.

Mr. FOWLER. So say I.

Mr. RUCKER. I am not here pleading for the rural carrier as an officeholder. I am not here pleading for him or pleading his necessities. I am here talking about him from the plain, common-sense standpoint of fair, even-handed justice between man and man. What must he do? Why, in the towns where the mail trains arrive early in the morning he must leave at 7 or 7.30, and in towns where the mails come at 10 o'clock he must leave at 10.30 or 11 o'clock. In communities where the mail on through trains reach the distributing point at noontime he must go at 1 o'clock. He must perform his work in the forenoon, he must perform it in the afternoon, and whether it is sunshine or rain, whether he is pierced by the cold blasts of winter or caressed by the balmy breezes of springtime, he must go, day after day. This last week, in visiting some of my friends in West Virginia, I daily saw a rural-route carrier wending his way over those mountain roads at 11 o'clock in the morning, just leaving town, with snow a foot and a half deep and the temperature below zero. He must perform that service and return to his home by nighttime.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I desire to say to the gentleman, in my town he would have to come at 7.30, and if the mail did not get in on time he would have to stay until 11.

Mr. RUCKER. Or later.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to say there are two amendments to be put. Is it the wish of the committee to have the first amendment put now or to have both put at the conclusion of general debate? The amendments are not necessarily related to each other.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can not we have the amendments read again?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COX. Has every one spoken who desires to do so? Has general debate been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. MONDELL. Is debate exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. No; under agreement debate on this paragraph runs until 2 o'clock.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. That will give three five-minute speeches. If members of the committee claim recognition for those three speeches, of course the Chair will have to recognize them as against other Members. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think I am as much in favor of justice to men who have to work for a living as any man on this floor. I want to see justice done to every rural letter carrier. I think, however, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is a reasonable amendment and will do no injustice to any man in the rural service. Now, let us look for a moment and see whether or not they are compensated as they ought to be. The men who carry the mails in the cities of the country as a rule are required to serve as long as three years as substitutes. During their substitute service they are required to report every morning at the post office for duty, and in the large cities, like Chicago, they are required to pay their fare back and forth, and the average earning power of a letter carrier during his three years' substitute service amounts to \$30 per month. At the end of his substitute service he goes into the regular service at \$800 a year. He works himself up to \$900, \$1,000, to \$1,100, and finally to \$1,200. It takes him nine years of service before he reaches the \$1,200 grade. It is true that he does not have to furnish equipment to carry the mails, but it is also true that the men who carry the mails on their backs in the great cities carry as much as 50 to 60 pounds of first-class mail in a single delivery and at the same time carry anywhere from 5 to 25 packages of parcel post. There is complaint about this overloading of the men. Whether the complaint is just or not I am not prepared to say, but I think it only fair to say to the men who are engaged in the Postal Service of the country, whether it be city or country, that the Postmaster General ought to have some discretionary power. If you take away the discretionary power of the Postmaster General he is a figurehead; he is a stalking horse; and any letter carrier can tell the Postmaster General what his duty is, and he has no power to resent a statement made by a letter

carrier. Now, it seems to me that there ought to be power somewhere to regulate. Let us see what the rules of the Department are to-day as to the rural carrier. Under the present rules of the department a man who carries a 24-mile route as a rural carrier gets \$1,200 a year. If he carries a certain weight of mail, regardless of the length of the route—whether it is 4 miles or 24 miles—he gets \$1,200 a year.

If his route requires him to work eight hours a day, regardless of the length of the route or weight of the mail he carries, he gets \$1,200 a year; and if he carries on a route of more than 24 miles, regardless of the weight of the mail, he gets \$12 per mile per annum for every extra mile over 24 miles. Those are the rules laid down by the department. Can anyone say that they are unjust or unreasonable? Ought anyone to say that the Postmaster General of a great country like this, charged with the responsibility of conducting a department that spends one-third of all the revenue of the Government of the United States, should have his hands so tied that a rural letter carrier or a city carrier can tell him what his business is? For one, I do not believe he should.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I will take just a moment of the time.

On March 6, 1914, a bill which had passed this and the other legislative body was approved, giving, as this body understood, and as the other body understood, and as the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill understood, \$1,200 to those rural carriers having 24-mile routes throughout the United States. A construction was placed upon that law absolutely adverse to that understanding by the Postmaster General. And this House, in order to make itself plain and understood and to instruct the Postmaster General, later, on the 6th day of August, 1914, expressed itself in the passage of a bill which placed a construction upon the original law which had been passed and approved. That bill evidently came to the notice of the Postmaster General, but he has insisted in refusing to accept the construction of the two bodies that passed this law, and now is asking, through the pending amendment, to have his discretion extended so that he may again place an unfavorable construction on what is believed by a large majority on both sides of this House to be just and fair. That is a regulation providing that the rural carriers having 24 miles or more on their routes should have \$1,200 per year. And I think instead of amending this so as to extend and continue that discretion, which has been used and operated against the carriers of the United States, we should make it so definite and certain, as it is in this bill, that neither the Postmaster General nor anyone else shall have any right or opportunity to misconstrue it through any discretion that we may see fit to grant him here. In this, our third effort, the Postmaster General should be able to catch our drift. It should be the purpose of administrative officers to execute the law as intended and expressed by the Congress rather than along lines of departmental policy or wish.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] moves to strike out, in line 9, page 52, the word "each" and to add to the word "carrier" in that line the letter "s," thereby amending this section. Although not clearly shown upon its face, it would vest in the Postmaster General similar powers which he has heretofore exercised. I have the greatest respect for the Postmaster General, and I know that he is endeavoring to make a splendid public official and to put the Post Office Department upon a self-sustaining basis.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has argued that the Postmaster General should be given great latitude in fixing the salaries and arranging details as to the rural letter carriers.

I represent a city district, and of course have no rural letter carriers there, but I also spend a part of the year in the country where we do have rural letter carriers. I am therefore much interested in their proper and fair treatment, because I observed from personal contact the arduous duties which they perform.

I can not see why Congress should not fix definitely the salaries to be received by these public servants. The last session we thought we were fixing their salaries, and we appropriated something like \$3,000,000 to pay for this increase. The Postmaster General, however, so construed his powers as to eliminate the extra pay almost totally, and thereby retaining in the Treasury about \$3,000,000 which Congress had intended to give to the rural letter carriers as increased pay. The Postmaster General understood definitely what Congress wanted, but he did not increase their salaries as was contemplated. I am therefore in favor of the bill as it stands, so that the rural letter carriers will know exactly what they are to receive and

so that the Postmaster General will know from this bill exactly what Congress intends their salaries to be. Congress defines and fixes the salaries in the various departments of other public officials, and there is no misconception as to what it is intended for them to receive, and I can not see why the same definiteness should not be defined in this bill.

Congress is a body which represents the great mass of the people. It is elected every two years. Its Representatives come in direct contact with the people of the country, and should, and do, reflect their views and wishes, and are directly accountable to them for the legislation which it passes. It is therefore clearly the duty of Congress to fix these salaries and not to leave it to the Postmaster General, as has been done.

I am proud of the fact that our Postmaster General has succeeded in placing the department upon a self-sustaining basis, and for this he deserves great credit and the thanks of the people of the land.

I realize that to perform the rural service as we are performing for the people of the country costs about \$39,000,000 in excess of what we receive in return in dollars and cents. I look upon the Postal System, however, upon a broad scale. It is the one department of the Government which is dear and close to the people. The expense in serving the mail to those sections of the country sparsely settled will probably not pay for many years to come, if at all, but the revenue received from those sections and cities thickly settled will abundantly provide for the loss in the sparsely settled sections. We should therefore look upon the system as one great, governmental department, and so long as it will make its own expenses and perform its great duty with efficiency and dispatch I am quite sure the people of this country will not only be satisfied but vastly gratified as well.

These rural letter carriers have considerable expense. They are compelled to provide their means of transportation and to deliver the mail each and every day in the year. While in the summer the work may be light and pleasant, in the winter it becomes onerous and very unpleasant. The roads in the greater part of the country where the mail is delivered by the rural carriers are not only bad in winter but often miserable and almost impassable.

I received a letter this morning from a rural carrier in my State, who says that during the summer one horse will perform the work on his route, but that during the winter he is compelled to have two horses to do the same service. There are many routes in the State of Maryland, especially those in the mountainous sections, where more than one horse is required almost constantly.

Mr. RUCKER. Most of them require two.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; most of them require two.

Mr. RUSSELL. And some of them three.

Mr. LINTHICUM. My friend from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] says three. We see, therefore, gentlemen, that the salary provided in this bill is largely taken up by the expense of the maintenance of the equipment necessary in the work.

I will say in conclusion, therefore, that I am heartily in favor of the passage of the bill as it stands, so that Congress will know that the rural carriers are to get the salary which it has fixed. The amounts are definite and certain, just as they should be, and as they are usually in all other departments of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say voices the action of the Post Office Committee of the House. There has been some talk here about the committee amendments. The action of the Post Office Committee of the House is contained in section 23, as reported in the bill on pages 52 and 53.

I am not one of those who wish to pay people more for their services to the Government than those services are really worth. I wish to say that when Congress at the last session passed the act that it did, everybody expected that the salary of the carriers on standard routes of 24 miles would be \$100 a month, or \$1,200 a year. And I will state further in that connection that, roundly speaking, there are a hundred million people in this country, and 25,000,000 of them, comparatively speaking, receive their mail at the hands of the rural carriers. No political party, I care not what the name of it is, will ever uproot this service. If they do, the life of that party will be short.

Now, as to the question of economy. Let us see about that. It has been argued here by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], the chairman of the committee, that it is at the expense of \$39,000,000, and that you may save that by abolishing the service. Yes. You could save \$100,000,000 by abolishing the

Navy Department; you could save \$100,000,000 and more by abolishing the War Department, and so on; but who wishes to do this? According to the reports of the department, the Postal Service is self-sustaining, and I want to see the man stand up here or stand up anywhere and tell his people that he wishes to make millions and millions of dollars out of the Postal Service for the general benefit of the Treasury of the United States, and that he wishes to use the Postal Service for that purpose. He will receive stay-at-home orders.

I am in favor of such economies as will in the end result in penny postage. That will come some day. It can not come now. Anyone who is conversant, anyone who knows the condition of the highways of this country at present will not vote for this amendment. In my country it has been raining for about six weeks, and the roads that are good ordinarily are almost impassable now, and I have had to go to the department and ask that the time limit be not called on carriers for that reason. Perhaps the work of those men in the summer time is easy and light, but in the winter it is onerous and heavy and burdensome. They do not get too much money.

Now, speaking of the contract system, that is in the air, but it will not be, my friend. It is not in the power of any party in this country to overturn the Rural Free Delivery Service and place it on a contract basis.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It was defeated on the floor of the House in the Fifty-seventh Congress, and voted down by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want a minute for explanation, by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. MOON. One minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has a minute.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] and some other gentleman stated, I am informed, that I had said if the word "each" were stricken out we could then go to the contract system. I did not say any such thing. Of course we know that the words of the act do not mean that. If the word "each" is stricken out, it will not restrict the discretion of the Postmaster General as it will be restricted if left in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent for a minute in which to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. If any carrier has 7,000 pounds or any other large quantity of freight to deliver, would it not be better, rather than reduce the salaries of all the other carriers, to hire a dray to carry his mail around in that instance?

Mr. MOON. Yes; but that does not apply at all.

Mr. ADAMSON. It applies to all heavy cases.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, what is the status of the bill as to amendments? Are further amendments permissible?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentleman can send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. MANN. There are two amendments now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. It will be lodged at the desk and may be called up in its order. The Clerk will now report the amendments in their order. First, the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Cox:

Page 52, line 9, strike out the word "each," and after the word "carrier" add the letter "s."

The CHAIRMAN. The first part will be considered separately. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. COX. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, yeas 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana now wish the second part of the amendment put?

Mr. COX. No; I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 10, strike out the word "standard."

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that amendment by striking out the word "standard" and inserting the word "rural."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "standard" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "rural."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute in the nature of an amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

The substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Have we agreed to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 5, after the word "annum," add the following: "And provided further, That no rural letter carrier shall be required to deliver mail on Christmas Day."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 26. That the act approved May 23, 1910 (ch. 255, 36 R. S., 416, now carried in Postal Laws and Regulations as sec. 931), be amended so as to read as follows: "Whenever the sender shall so request, a receipt shall be taken on the delivery of any registered mail matter showing to whom and when and place where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that section. It is new legislation, not provided for by the rule that was reported by the Committee on Rules the other day.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, this section is the law now, except the words "when and place where," on line 4, page 54. It was not included in the rule making new legislation in order at the request of the department. The department seems not to desire the section now, although they did, probably, in the first instance desire it, and I am glad to see the point of order made against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] asks unanimous consent to address the committee for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. Who is it that wants to talk 20 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] wants to address the committee for 20 minutes.

Mr. MOON. I thought I had an arrangement with the gentleman to wait until some other matters were discussed.

Mr. STEENERSON. I prefer to proceed now. This is the end of the bill, as I understand it.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude this matter, anyway, before the gentleman speaks. I want to move to add to the close of this bill—

Mr. STEENERSON. I will suspend for the present. I want to be heard at the conclusion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota will be recognized at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, after the words "Navy mail clerks," on line 17, page 53, I offer an amendment as follows: "All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, after line 17, as a separate paragraph, insert the following: "SEC. 25. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] asks unanimous consent to address the committee for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. I am not going to object, Mr. Chairman, but I thought there was a very positive understanding with the gentleman from Minnesota to the effect that the 20 minutes he was going to take were to come after the 2 minutes I was going to take for myself and the 10 minutes that were to be taken by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY].

Mr. STEENERSON. I am willing to wait until the gentleman does that.

Mr. MOON. There is no objection to the gentleman speaking. It is just a question of the order of speaking.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am perfectly agreeable to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the request, with the understanding that the time to be occupied by the gentleman from Minnesota will be occupied after the other gentlemen conclude.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, can we not finish up this bill?

Mr. MOON. This is a matter that the gentleman will not object to when he understands it. It is a matter that ought to come in the committee, and not in the House, and when the gentleman concludes what he has to say I will move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] is recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the public service of Senators and Representatives is hardly ever fully appreciated by the people they represent, unless it is possibly the services of that class of Representatives who maintain a press bureau for the advertisement of their official acts. I doubt very much, sir, whether we appreciate the value of the services of our own colleagues until after they go out from among us.

As we are closing this bill, the last one in the making of which certain gentlemen on the Post Office Committee will participate, I feel it is due that I should acknowledge to this House the splendid, unselfish, and patriotic service, the courteous conduct and demeanor at all times, and the aid rendered by the Hon. SAMUEL W. SMITH, of Michigan; the Hon. THOMAS L. REILLY, of Connecticut; the Hon. WILLIAM E. TUTTLE, jr., of New Jersey; the Hon. H. ROBERT FOWLER, of Illinois; and the Hon. FRANK E. WILSON, of New York. [Applause.] During the years they have served upon this committee the chairman has been very much benefited by their advice and counsel, as have the other members of the committee; and as they go out of public life for the present I feel it is due to them that we thus publicly acknowledge their splendid service to the country. I trust that they may come back if they desire or that they may go into other public service if they desire it; because if the people lose the service of these men in some capacity, they lose some of the most faithful public servants who have ever acted in behalf of a great people. [Applause.] We will not forget them, Mr. Chairman, on account of the pleasant social relations we have had with them, nor can we forget them because of the great good that they have done in office. [Applause.]

I now ask unanimous consent that our friend, Mr. REILLY of Connecticut, may address the House for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY] may address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, while not long on "fare thee wells," while realizing that there is plenty in this busy House to do without taking up its time with swan songs, while knowing that Members who are to remain and are to come are of more importance than those who are to go, yet I can not permit this occasion, the passing of this great supply bill, to go by without a word or two of a somewhat personal nature and yet in a way related to this legislation.

This is the last Post Office appropriation bill in the adoption of which I will take any part, for two years at least [laughter], because of a recent decision of what I think was a temporarily misled constituency [laughter], yet a constituency which I respect; yes, love—a constituency of which any Member of this splendid body, even those of far greater fame than I, might well be proud.

It is a real honor to be a Member of this House. It is high honor to be a Member for even a day; it is a higher honor to be

a Member for a term, and higher still to be sent here year after year as many men on both sides of the aisle are sent. It is high honor, indeed, to be associated with the membership of this House for any length of time—a membership as high class, as honorable, as patriotic as any similar body in the world. Did I say similar body? Then change that, for there is no similar body. The American House of Representatives is in a class by itself. It is composed of men selected from the flower of the citizenry of the greatest nation God in His wisdom ever made. Able, honorable, and true, devoted to their country, their duty, and their friends, fortunate is the man who can address them as "My colleagues."

Among the great committees of this great legislative body stands the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, of which for nearly four years I have been a member. This committee has to do with the greatest service in the world—the Postal Service. It is closer to the Nation, the State, the city, the family, than any other. Without this service business would be paralyzed; without it modern society could not exist. Yes, indeed, it is worth while to be associated in any way with this wonderful organization, so truly and effectively described on the front of the beautiful new Post Office Building yonder by the station.

Enlarger of the common life.
Carrier of news and knowledge.
Instrument of trade and industry.
Messenger of sympathy and love.
Servant of parted friends.
Consoler of the lonely.
Bond of the scattered family.

[Applause.]

This service carries the largest appropriation—nearly \$322,000,000—made by this Government, and it is a source of great satisfaction to know that it has been placed on a self-sustaining basis. Yet if it were not, it would be worth all it costs. That it has been placed on the high plane of efficiency it occupies is due in great part to the personnel, from the Postmaster General to the special-delivery messenger boy.

It is therefore a source of keenest satisfaction to know that we have had some share in making that great army of faithful postal employees more contented and happy and thereby more devoted to duty, for the contented man, the one who feels that he is getting a square deal, is the efficient and devoted man. The most prosperous business concern or corporation is the one with satisfied help; the most successful government is the one with a contented constituency. Fair treatment and good wages make for loyalty, and a loyal corps of employees in every branch of the public service is the best asset this country can have.

It has been a pleasure and honor to have had something to do with the establishment of the parcel post and the postal savings bank. It is still greater pleasure and honor to realize that we also have had something to do with the improvement of the working conditions of the vital force, the bone and sinew of the Postal Service—the rank and file of the employees. If we had done no other thing than to have helped lighten the burdens of the men and women who toil for their daily bread in the service of the Government and to improve their condition in life, the time has been well spent. I hope you will bear with me for a few minutes more to draw your attention to some of the commendable things that the Sixty-second Congress and Sixty-third Congress have done for these employees, and to urge my friends on both sides of the House who will be Members of the next Congress to guard them with care.

The eight-hour law for post-office clerks and letter carriers, the 8 hours to be confined to a period of not more than 10 consecutive hours, is, to my mind, one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation enacted by the Congress in recent years. Prior to the enactment of the eight-hour law, post-office clerks could be required to work any number of hours in any day and were not paid for any overtime, as there was no limit placed on their day's work. The letter carriers were working under what was known as a 48-hour law, but it gave no protection whatever to the men. Their schedules ranged over periods varying from 10 to 18 hours each day, and even when they were required to work more than 48 hours in a week they were not paid for overtime. No consideration whatever was shown to the carriers, and the result was that the complaints became so numerous that the eight-hour-in-ten law was passed by Congress to remedy the unsatisfactory conditions surrounding the postal employees.

The law which grants compensatory time to employees for services performed on Sundays, to be given on one of the six days following the Sunday on which work is performed, was another piece of legislation that was of great benefit to the Postal Service as well as to the postal employees. It has been

changed in this bill so that for the Sunday work in December, or during the rush of the holiday season, the compensatory time may be given during the succeeding January.

The pay of substitute employees in the Postal Service was raised to 35 cents an hour for vacation and auxiliary work and 40 cents an hour when substitutes were working in the places of regular employees off duty without pay. This legislation was also of material benefit to the service, as it gave the substitutes an opportunity to make sufficient income to keep them in the service until they secured positions as regular employees. Prior to the enactment of the legislation which increased the hourly pay of substitutes these employees did not make sufficient money to pay their living expenses, and a large percentage of them resigned from the service each year in order to accept employment where the income and future prospects were brighter than in the Postal Service.

The antigag law which was passed by the Sixty-second Congress gave the postal employees the rights of which they had been deprived by Executive orders. Prior to the enactment of the antigag law an employee had no redress for any grievance other than reporting it to the official who was actually responsible for the cause of complaint. If an employee wrote to his Member of Congress and it became known to the postal officials it would be cause for his removal from the service. The antigag law not only restores postal employees to all the rights and privileges of which they had been deprived by Executive orders, but it also protects them in their positions by requiring that they be furnished with a copy of all charges that might be preferred against them, and they are given an opportunity to submit their defense in writing.

The law which reclassifies and regulates the salaries of the railway mail clerks is also a piece of constructive legislation that will stand to the credit of the Sixty-third Congress. Many necessary reforms have been brought about in the Railway Mail Service which at the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress was in a chaotic state on account of the discontent among the employees, which was brought about through the so-called reforms of a former administration of the Post Office Department.

The rural letter carriers have had their salaries increased in the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses by the enactment of legislation which was of great benefit to the Rural Delivery Service and the rural letter carriers. The pay of many rural carriers has never been commensurate with the work they perform and the outlay in furnishing proper vehicles for the delivery and collection of the mail in rural communities. I trust it will not be long before a law will be passed that will grant the rural letter carriers an annual allowance for horse hire.

The enactment of the law passed by the Sixty-third Congress which grants compensation to postal employees who are injured in the performance of their duties or to the relatives of employees who lose their lives is in keeping with the spirit of the times.

In looking back over the work of the past four years it is a source of great satisfaction to me to know that one has played some small part in trying to bring about the reforms above mentioned. My only regret is that through force of circumstances I will have to lay aside this work which has been so pleasing because of the improvements that were being brought about in the Postal Service and of the benefit that they have been to the working force of that service. For the distinguished and able chairman and members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads I have grown to have not only great respect and admiration for the patriotic spirit shown by them when considering all the questions submitted to the Post Office Committee, but I also have a feeling of warm affection for each of them, on account of the noble and manly qualities of which I have learned while being associated with them.

My colleagues, Democratic, Republican, and Progressive, I bid you Godspeed, and give to you out of a full heart my best wishes in all your hopes and ambitions. While I can not be with you to take part in the activities of legislative life, my thoughts for your well-being will always be with you. The friendships formed here will never, I trust, be broken. May I be permitted to say, now and in the years to come, with the writer of these sweet lines:

Friends, though scarce, we sometimes find,
Whose hearts are always true and warm,
Who, like the ivy 'round the tree,
Cling closest in the raging storm.
Should sorrow e'er thy beauty sear,
Such friendship still I'll feel for thee;
And when thou think'st of friend sincere
I trust you will remember me.

[Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing, the time of Mr. REILLY of Connecticut having expired, at the request of Mr. Moon and Mr. MADDEN leave was given him to conclude his remarks,

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have already pointed out that the war in Europe has been put forth by the present administration as the justification for the withholding of needed mail facilities in rural districts and for the proposal to reduce expenses by substituting a contract service for the present Rural-Delivery Service, and also for the advancement of the new policy of making the Postal Service contribute to the general support of the Government. The claim is that the war has shut off imports, and thereby reduced customs revenues. President Wilson, in his address to Congress on September 4, asking for the war-revenue law, used this language:

During the month of August there was, as compared with the corresponding month of last year, a falling off of \$10,629,538 in the revenues collected from customs. A continuation of this decrease in the same proportion throughout the current fiscal year would probably mean a loss of customs revenues of from sixty to one hundred millions. I need not tell you to what this falling off is due. It is due in chief part not to the reductions recently made in the customs duties, but to the great decrease in importations, and that is due to the extraordinary extent of the industrial area affected by the present war in Europe.

This statement—that there is a decrease in importations—has been repeated during the debate on this bill on this floor and is found in the official communications of the Post Office Department to Congress.

I want to call attention to the fact that the President compares the falling off in revenue under the Underwood law with the receipts under the Payne law. Of course he overlooks the slight difference in the rates of duty. He should have remembered that his party, and especially he as the candidate, promised the people a downward revision, and that they gave us a downward revision, and that therefore, unless the importations were very largely increased, necessarily the receipts from customs would be diminished. In his campaign letter to Mr. UNDERWOOD a month later he went still further and said that it was the war, and nothing but war, that caused the falling off in revenues from customs receipts. Now, what are the facts? The official figures are now before us. They were not fully before us at the time of the discussion of the war-revenue bill.

I hold in my hand a document issued by the Department of Commerce, the Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance of the United States.

The October number has recently been issued; we have not yet got the November or the December number. On the first page containing the tables we find the following total imports of merchandise for October, 1913, \$132,149,302. For October, 1912, \$138,880,850, an increase for one month of about \$6,000,000. I find in the column 10 months ending October, 1914, the total imports of merchandise were \$1,548,531,394. For the same 10 months of 1913, \$1,460,364,000, or \$88,196,921 more during the first 10 months of calendar year 1914 than for the corresponding period the year before.

These 10 months I call to your attention were the first 10 months that the Underwood law was in effect. It was not in full effect until the 1st of March. It took effect as to wool in January. So you see that instead of there being a falling off in imports there has been an increase in imports of over eighty millions in 10 months. I have the figures which I got by telephone from the Department of Commerce as to the receipts and imports for November, the month just past. I find that the total imports of merchandise for the last month, November, 1914, \$126,467,907, and the duties from customs \$16,924,408.

Now, if we had a similar amount of importations for December, and they will be much larger from the preliminary figures I have received, there will be \$252,935,814, or in round numbers additional two hundred and fifty-three millions for the two months completing the calendar year of 1914, and will make the total imports of merchandise for the 12 months \$1,801,531,394, as against \$1,793,138,480 for calendar year 1913, or \$8,392,914 more for 1914 than 1913.

Where, then, is the contention that the war in Europe has diminished the imports? The contention is simply a fallacy and not true. You may excuse a man in the excitement of a campaign for exaggeration; you can excuse a candidate for telling a whopper just before election; but now that the campaign is over and the official records are available it seems to me that you ought to cease repeating the statement and come back to facts.

Now, as a ground for explaining the embarrassed condition of the Treasury and the deficit, the conclusion has been drawn that the revenues from customs were disappointing to the Democrats. There never was a greater fallacy. How much revenue did you expect from the Underwood law? You have got within a small fraction of what was predicted for it. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 30, 1913, page 5233, from

Mr. UNDERWOOD's final speech on the conference report. He said:

The income tax, leaving out those features that relate to the tax on corporations, will produce above \$83,000,000. The corporation part of the income tax included in the bill, it is estimated, will produce \$39,000,000. The customs taxes for the year 1915 are estimated to produce \$249,000,000.

Taking the other sources of revenue that the Government now has and adding to them the income tax and the customs laws that are affected by this bill, it will produce for the fiscal year 1915, according to our estimates, \$1,026,000,000; and if the expenditures of the Government do not exceed \$1,008,000,000, which is the estimate that will cover the expenditures of the Government for that year, the bill will produce a surplus revenue of \$18,000,000, which the committee considers as a safe balance on the right side of the ledger.

Mr. UNDERWOOD says that in the fiscal year it will produce \$249,000,000. Well, the Payne bill produced \$318,000,000, so there was expected to be a decline. When you passed the Underwood law you expected there would be \$249,000,000 revenue instead of \$311,257,348, which was the amount collected in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912, so that you can not lay that to the war. You are not disappointed as to the income produced by the Underwood law, because you expected it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

So, putting the total customs duties collected for the first 10 months of 1914, as given in the October summary, of \$209,000,000, and adding \$16,924,408, customs receipts for last month, and a similar amount for this month, you will have \$243,418,045, only \$5,581,955 less than Mr. UNDERWOOD's estimate, or practically the same as his estimate.

If you calculate that December will produce only as much as November, then the difference would certainly not be in excess of \$6,000,000 less than the estimate of Mr. UNDERWOOD at the time he spoke on the conference report.

Now, then, what justification have you, what justification did the President have, for blaming the war in Europe for the lower customs revenue when you are getting the revenue that you expected? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Where is the Democratic blunder that has brought embarrassment upon us which necessitates the recommendation of destroying the rural service and bleeding the Postal Service to support the Government? The blunder consisted not in misfiguring the income from tariff but from other sources. These are official figures, and you all can find them in Monthly Summary for the months referred to. I will insert the page from the October, 1914, Summary, where it gives the imports for the first 10 months of the calendar year 1914 and also the ad valorem rate on dutiable and on all imports for the respective periods. The rate for 1912, under the Payne law, was 39.54 per cent on dutiable and 18.30 per cent on total imports, and about the same for 1913, while in the 10 months of 1914 the rate under the new law was only 35.02 per cent on dutiable and 13.53 per cent on total imports. For October, 1914, the rate on total imports was only 11.78 per cent.

The blunder was in the income tax. You fell short \$51,000,000, the difference between \$122,000,000, which you estimated you would get from the corporation and income tax, and the \$71,386,156 which you actually got from that source. You fell short more than \$51,000,000, and that is the chief element which causes embarrassment in the Treasury. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means estimated that your appropriations would be \$1,008,000,000. That was for the fiscal year 1915—the current year. What were they? I have the Book of Estimates, issued by the Treasury Department, and there is no guesswork about this. The total appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 were \$1,094,168,102.38. He estimated that you were

going to appropriate \$1,008,000,000, and you appropriated \$86,000,000 more than you said you would. There was another blunder. The appropriation of \$1,094,168,102.38 for the fiscal year 1915, instead of \$1,008,000,000, as you said you proposed to appropriate, and the falling short of the income tax and the corporation tax in the sum of \$51,000,000 is the cause of your trouble. What would have been the result if you had had the Payne rates? It has been demonstrated to a mathematical certainty. The rate under the Underwood law, applied to the free and dutiable goods together, was 13.53 per cent, a little over 13½ per cent, for the first 10 months of the calendar year 1914, but only 11.78 per cent for October. This is also given in this same publication issued by the Department of Commerce for the very period in question. Under the Payne law the rate was 18.34 per cent for 1913. How could you expect to get as much money when you collected only 13½ per cent ad valorem on the total amount of importations, instead of 18½ per cent? It seems to me it is entirely unjustifiable to expect anything of that kind. If you apply—and this is relevant because of the address of the President on September 4—the Payne duties, you would have had, according to my calculation—and you can calculate it yourself—about eighty-six or eighty-seven million dollars more of customs revenue on the same importations that actually came in than you obtained. It could not be a surprise to a sane man that you got less on substantially the same amount of imports under a lower than a higher rate. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] estimated the falling off of revenue very closely. He can not be surprised or disappointed, for he predicted the result very closely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. So that the cause of all of this trouble in the Treasury, this falling off of the available balance from \$144,000,000 to a little over \$66,000,000, as it is to-day—the excess of expenditures over receipts which we are now experiencing—is directly due to the decrease of customs receipts under Democratic tariff legislation, and not to accident, not to war. It is due to miscalculation as to the amount of income to be derived from the income and the corporation tax; and to the large—I will not say extravagant—appropriations—\$86,000,000 more than you officially estimated you would appropriate. Therefore, it seems to me, it is about time that the leaders of the Democratic Party should acknowledge the truth. You may as well do it now as later, because sooner or later you will have to acknowledge that these are the facts, that these are the causes for the falling off of income—miscalculation, blunder; not any misfortune because of the war. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is important for the people to know, because the war came along and we can not end it. If our difficulties in the Treasury were due to the war, we would have to submit, and perhaps it would be justifiable to resort to bleeding the postal receipts to support the Government; but, seeing that the cause is not the war in Europe, but is Democratic blundering in legislation, then that is a cause that can be removed. [Applause on Republican side.] And, gentlemen, it will be removed by the people, and you may as well acknowledge that you were mistaken and be honest and candid and fair on this proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Monthly summary of foreign commerce of the United States, October, 1914.

FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES—SUMMARY OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

[Figures in all statements for October, 1914, and for 10 months ending October, 1914, subject to revision. Figures of imports for October, 1913, include only entries under the tariff law of 1913, beginning with the fourth day of the month. The entries of the first three days of the month under the law of 1909, amounting to, approximately, \$13,665,000, are included with September totals.]

Groups.	October—				Ten months ending October—					
	1913		1914		1912		1913		1914	
IMPORTS.										
Free of duty:	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Per ct.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Per ct.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Per ct.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Per ct.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Per ct.</i>
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	34,125,086	41.84	38,012,461	43.72	412,197,299	50.73	404,684,750	51.69	462,785,295	48.71
Foodstuffs in crude condition, and food animals....	18,547,338	22.75	18,700,188	21.51	157,946,743	19.44	136,919,651	17.49	167,181,245	17.59
Foodstuffs partly or wholly manufactured.....	2,871,232	3.52	5,399,883	6.21	10,432,004	1.28	9,515,804	1.22	49,918,371	5.25
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	15,320,770	18.79	13,803,207	15.88	137,821,073	16.95	153,594,341	19.62	159,801,979	16.82
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	10,037,469	12.30	10,580,865	12.17	84,029,120	10.34	70,821,349	9.05	101,439,869	10.68
Miscellaneous.....	651,994	.80	447,916	.51	10,178,291	1.25	7,269,497	.93	8,994,580	.95
Total free of duty.....	81,553,889	100.00	86,944,520	100.00	812,604,530	100.00	782,805,392	100.00	950,121,340	100.00

Monthly summary of foreign commerce of the United States, October, 1914—Continued.
FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES—SUMMARY OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS—continued.

Groups.	October—				Ten months ending October—							
	1913		1914		1912		1913		1914			
IMPORTS—continued.												
Dutiable:	Dollars.	Per ct.	Dollars.	Per ct.	Dollars.	Per ct.	Dollars.	Per ct.	Dollars.	Per ct.		
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	5,687,772	11.07	5,943,783	11.63	111,560,797	15.98	91,028,299	13.44	62,914,297	10.51		
Foodstuffs in crude condition, and food animals.....	4,328,202	8.42	2,725,847	5.33	37,639,959	5.39	28,576,800	4.22	29,753,359	4.97		
Foodstuffs partly or wholly manufactured.....	10,124,960	19.70	12,875,065	25.17	171,973,679	24.63	150,491,769	23.10	176,720,669	29.53		
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	7,074,654	13.76	7,146,388	13.98	124,638,840	17.85	134,603,391	19.86	78,753,213	13.16		
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	23,640,395	46.00	21,673,417	42.38	249,040,959	35.66	262,849,172	38.79	245,432,461	41.02		
Miscellaneous.....	539,430	1.05	771,500	1.51	3,423,949	.49	3,979,541	.69	4,836,155	.81		
Total dutiable.....	51,395,412	100.00	51,136,000	100.00	698,278,183	100.00	677,528,981	100.00	598,410,054	100.00		
Free and dutiable:												
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	39,812,858	29.94	43,956,244	31.84	523,758,096	34.66	495,713,049	33.95	525,699,593	33.95		
Foodstuffs in crude condition, and food animals.....	22,875,540	17.21	21,426,035	15.52	195,586,702	12.94	165,496,460	11.33	196,934,604	12.72		
Foodstuffs partly or wholly manufactured.....	12,996,192	9.78	18,274,948	13.23	182,405,683	12.08	166,007,573	11.37	226,638,940	14.63		
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	22,395,424	16.85	20,949,595	15.17	262,459,913	17.37	288,197,732	19.73	238,555,192	15.41		
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	33,677,864	25.32	32,254,282	23.36	333,070,079	22.05	333,670,521	22.85	346,872,330	22.40		
Miscellaneous.....	1,191,424	.90	1,219,416	.88	13,602,240	.90	11,249,038	.77	13,830,735	.89		
Total imports of merchandise.....	132,949,302	100.00	138,080,520	100.00	1,510,882,713	100.00	1,460,334,373	100.00	1,548,531,394	100.00		
Per cent of free.....		61.34		62.97		53.78		53.60		61.36		
Duties collected from customs.....	30,138,049		16,271,829		276,425,106		267,868,193		209,569,229			
Average ad valorem rate.....	on dutiable.....	58.64		31.82		39.59		39.54		35.02		
	on total imports.....	22.67		11.78		18.30		18.34		13.53		
Remaining in warehouse at the end of the month.....	85,843,119		84,289,172									
EXPORTS.												
Domestic:												
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	125,239,556	46.56	32,989,050	17.27	561,163,229	30.49	552,654,073	27.99	230,411,330	14.13		
Foodstuffs in crude condition, and food animals.....	11,764,519	4.37	36,224,327	18.91	98,548,106	5.35	150,590,870	7.62	395,003,669	24.21		
Foodstuffs partly or wholly manufactured.....	29,775,473	11.07	37,411,532	19.58	246,704,031	13.41	266,569,703	13.50	187,677,403	11.51		
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	32,678,284	12.15	28,571,130	14.95	320,715,546	17.43	338,975,547	17.17	290,860,629	17.83		
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	68,824,465	25.58	53,589,172	28.05	607,023,512	32.98	658,791,771	33.37	519,544,574	31.85		
Miscellaneous.....	721,137	.27	2,244,165	1.24	6,119,548	.34	6,844,101	.35	7,607,710	.47		
Total domestic.....	269,003,434	100.00	191,029,376	100.00	1,840,273,972	100.00	1,974,425,065	100.00	1,631,105,315	100.00		
Foreign:												
Free of duty.....	1,633,613	57.15	3,208,406	73.33	18,582,270	61.16	18,921,617	61.31	19,817,547	62.55		
Dutiable.....	1,224,417	42.85	1,166,848	26.67	11,801,753	38.84	11,935,940	38.69	11,883,757	37.45		
Total foreign.....	2,858,030	100.00	4,375,254	100.00	30,384,023	100.00	30,857,557	100.00	31,701,304	100.00		
Total exports.....	271,861,464		195,404,630		1,870,657,995		2,005,283,622		1,662,806,619			
Excess of exports.....	138,912,162		57,324,110		359,775,282		544,949,249		114,275,225			
Total imports and exports.....	404,810,766		333,485,150		3,381,540,708		3,465,617,995		3,211,338,013			

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a service in this House for 20 years is a long service, and I think I would be neglectful if I did not express on behalf of this side of the House, and I think the whole House, our regret at losing one of the most genial and earnest and honest Members of the House, the ranking Republican on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH]. [Applause.] Modest to a degree, earnest and faithful, he has endeared himself to the hearts of all who knew him here, and wherever he may be in life he carries with him the respect and the best wishes of the Members of the National House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the pending Post Office appropriation bill contains a large amount of legislation, in the main, if not entirely, good reform legislation. The Postmaster General was for many years a Member of this House and received his training in governmental affairs here, and while there is and necessarily will be at different times and from different quarters criticism of the Post Office Department, I am unwilling to let the occasion go by without saying that I think this former Member of this House, Postmaster General Burleson, is handling himself in that office at the head of that great department in a wonderfully satisfactory manner. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be instructed to renumber the sections of the bill so that they may follow in proper numerical order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now arise and report the bill to the House with the various amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 19906, the Post Office appropriation bill, and had instructed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill with instructions.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit with instructions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEENERSON moves to recommit the bill H. R. 19906 to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment:

After line 8, on page 5, insert the following:

"For compensation to assistant postmasters at first and second class post offices, 5, at not exceeding \$4,000 each; 42 at not exceeding \$3,000 each; 10 at not exceeding \$2,500 each; 5 at not exceeding \$2,000 each; 16 at not exceeding \$1,900 each; 45 at not exceeding \$1,800 each; 95 at not exceeding \$1,700 each; 150 at not exceeding \$1,600 each; 180 at not exceeding \$1,500 each; 150 at not exceeding \$1,400 each; 350 at not exceeding \$1,300 each; 550 at not exceeding \$1,200 each; 525 at not exceeding \$1,100 each; 300 at not exceeding \$1,000 each; 130 at not exceeding \$900 each; 100 at not exceeding \$800 each; in all, \$3,200,000.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota demands a division.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-two gentlemen have risen on the demand for the yeas and nays, not a sufficient number.

Mr. MANN and Mr. STEENERSON. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The other side is demanded. Those opposed will rise and stand until counted. Seventy-three gentlemen have risen in the negative—

Mr. MANN. That would give the yeas and nays, and as a matter of convenience, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT OVER NEW YEAR'S DAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Before the gentleman makes the point of no quorum I would like to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANN. I withhold the point of no quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next, so that Members may have their customary New Year's holiday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday. Is there objection?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Alabama have any doubt that the House will work to-morrow if this request is not granted? Some of us think it will. This is about the shortest session we could possibly have.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the House would work to-morrow, but I do not know whether we will have a quorum, and probably will work, but I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina it has been customary always to adjourn over New Year's Day. I think the appropriation bills are in better condition and further advanced now than at any other time. I make this request as a matter of usual custom, and I do not think there is any danger of the House not getting through with the appropriation bills at the present time.

Mr. MANN. It will not advance business by having a meeting to-morrow or on Saturday, even, but will simply discommode a large number of Members, and progress will not be made by it. That side will lose a lot of cooperation on this side—

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if it is not usual for the House not to reconvene until after the first Monday of the new year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; we have taken less holiday this year than ever before. As far as I am personally concerned, I have no desire in the matter—

Mr. FINLEY. My sole purpose in asking the question was that I had in mind possibly the appropriation bills coming up and general debate could be had, and that would be gotten through with. I shall not object, however.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not get through announcing the result of the demand for the yeas and nays. There are 32 in favor and 73 against, and 32 is a sufficient number.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order of no quorum as a convenience to Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 68, nays 150, answered "present" 2, not voting 208, as follows:

YEAS—68.

Bell, Cal.	Bryan	Cooper	Curry
Browne, Wis.	Burke, S. Dak.	Cramton	Danforth
Browning	Campbell	Crosser	Dillon

Falconer	Keating	Manahan
Gillett	Kelley, Mich.	Morgan, Okla.
Green, Iowa	Kelly, Pa.	Nelson
Greene, Vt.	Kennedy, R. I.	Nolan, J. I.
Hamilton, Mich.	Kettner	Norton
Hawley	Kiess, Pa.	Parker, N. J.
Hayes	Kindel	Patten, Pa.
Helgesen	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Plumley
Hinds	Konop	Rogers
Howell	Lafferty	Rupley
Humphrey, Wash.	La Follette	Scott
Johnson, Utah	Lenroot	Seldomridge
Johnson, Wash.	McLaughlin	Sinnott
Kahn	MacDonald	Sloan

NAYS—150.

Abercrombie	Finley	Leshner	Smith, N. Y.
Adair	FitzHenry	Lever	Smith, Tex.
Adamson	Flood, Va.	Lewis, Md.	Sparkman
Alexander	Foster	Lithicum	Stanley
Ashbrook	Fowler	Lloyd	Stedman
Aswell	Francis	Lonergan	Stephens, Nebr.
Baker	Garner	McKellar	Stephens, Tex.
Bathrick	Garrett, Tex.	Madden	Stone
Beakes	Gerry	Maguire, Nebr.	Stout
Bell, Ga.	Gill	Mitchell	Stringer
Blackmon	Gilmore	Montague	Summers
Boehrer	Gittins	Moon	Taggart
Borland	Goodwin, Ark.	Morrison	Talcott, N. Y.
Broussard	Gray	Moss, Ind.	Tavener
Brown, N. Y.	Gudger	Murray	Taylor, Ala.
Buchanan, Ill.	Hamlin	Oldfield	Taylor, Ark.
Buchanan, Tex.	Hardy	Padgett	Taylor, Colo.
Bulkley	Harris	Page, N. C.	Thacher
Burgess	Harrison	Park	Thomas
Byrnes, S. C.	Hay	Post	Thompson, Okla.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hayden	Pou	Thomson, Ill.
Candler, Miss.	Helm	Quin	Tribble
Caraway	Henry	Ragsdale	Underwood
Carter	Hill	Rainey	Vaughan
Church	Holland	Raker	Vinson
Collier	Howard	Rauch	Vollmer
Connelly, Kans.	Hoxworth	Rayburn	Watkins
Cox	Hull	Reilly, Conn.	Watson
Cullop	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly, Wis.	Weaver
Dent	Igoe	Rouse	Webb
Dickinson	Jacoway	Rubey	Whaley
Dies	Johnson, Ky.	Rucker	Whitacre
Donovan	Johnson, S. C.	Russell	Williams
Doolittle	Kennedy, Conn.	Saunders	Wingo
Dupré	Kent	Shackleford	Witherspoon
Evans	Key, Ohio	Sherwood	Young, Tex.
Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Sims	
Ferris	Lee, Pa.	Small	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Mann

Shreve

NOT VOTING—208.

Alken	Deitrick	Hart	Neely, W. Va.
Ainey	Dershem	Haugen	O'Brien
Allen	Difenderfer	Heffin	Oglesby
Anderson	Dixon	Helvering	O'Hair
Ansberry	Donohoe	Hensley	O'Leary
Anthony	Dooling	Hinebaugh	O'Shaunessy
Austin	Doremus	Hobson	Paige, Mass.
Avis	Doughton	Houston	Palmer
Bailey	Driscoll	Hughes, Ga.	Parker, N. Y.
Baltz	Drukker	Hughes, W. Va.	Patten, N. Y.
Barchfeld	Dunn	Hulings	Peters
Barkley	Eagan	Jones	Peterson
Barnhart	Eagle	Keister	Phelan
Bartholdt	Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Platt
Bartlett	Edwards	Kinkaid, N. J.	Porter
Barton	Elder	Kitchin	Powers
Beall, Tex.	Esch	Knowland, J. R.	Price
Borchers	Estopinal	Korby	Prouty
Bowdle	Fairchild	Kreider	Reed
Britten	Faison	Langham	Riordan
Brockson	Farr	Langley	Roberts, Mass.
Brodbeck	Fess	Lazaro	Roberts, Nev.
Brown, W. Va.	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Rothermel
Bruckner	Fitzgerald	L'Engle	Sabath
Brumbaugh	Floyd, Ark.	Levy	Scully
Burke, Pa.	Fordney	Lewis, Pa.	Sells
Burke, Wis.	Frear	Lieb	Sherley
Burnett	French	Lindbergh	Sisson
Butler	Gallagher	Lindquist	Slayden
Calder	Gallivan	Lobeck	Slomp
Callaway	Gard	Loft	Smith, J. M. C.
Cantor	Gardner	Logue	Smith, Md.
Cantrill	Garrett, Tenn.	McAndrews	Stafford
Carew	George	McClellan	Stephens, Miss.
Carlin	Glass	McGillcuddy	Stevens, N. H.
Carr	Godwin, N. C.	McGuire, Okla.	Sutherland
Cary	Goeke	McKenzie	Talbot, Md.
Casey	Goldfogle	Mahan	Taylor, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Good	Maher	Ten Eyck
Clancy	Gordon	Mapes	Townsend
Clark, Fla.	Gorman	Martin	Tuttle
Claypool	Goulden	Metz	Underhill
Cline	Graham, Ill.	Miller	Vare
Coady	Graham, Pa.	Mondell	Walker
Connolly, Iowa	Greene, Mass.	Moore	Wallin
Conry	Gregg	Morgan, La.	Walsh
Copley	Griest	Morin	Walters
Crisp	Griffin	Moss, W. Va.	White
Dale	Guernsey	Mott	Wilson, Fla.
Davenport	Hamill	Mulkey	Wilson, N. Y.
Davis	Hamilton, N. Y.	Murdock	Winslow
Decker	Hammond	Neeley, Kans.	Woodruff

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.

On this vote:

Mr. MOORE, to recommit, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, against.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, to recommit, with Mr. LEE of Georgia, against.

Mr. GRIEST, to recommit, with Mr. WILSON of New York, against.

Until further notice:

Mr. MAHAN with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. GOULDEN with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BAILEY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. FAIR.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. FESS.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. BARTON.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. CARY.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. CLINE with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. COADY with Mr. COPELY.

Mr. CRISP with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. HINEBAUGH.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. DERSHEM with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. DIXON with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. EAGLE with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. LINDBERGH.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. MAPES.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. MILLER.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. LIEB with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. PHELAN with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.

Mr. SISSON with Mr. VARE.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. WALTERS.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. HART with Mr. WOODRUFF.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. MOON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HENSLEY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, for one day, on account of sickness in his family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of the Southern Claims Commission, No. 13183, George W. Morris, no adverse report having been made thereon.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20150) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and, pending that, I would ask the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] what arrangements we can make, if any, relative to general debate.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. What has the gentleman from Texas to suggest?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have a request for only one hour on this side. I desire to state that it will be occupied by one speech.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say, Mr. Speaker, an hour on a side will be satisfactory to us.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill H. R. 20150, the Indian appropriation bill, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to two hours, one hour to be controlled by himself and the other by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE]. Is there objection to this request?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee if he proposes to finish general debate this afternoon and not to go into the five-minute rule?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is our desire.

Mr. HARRISON. I may want half an hour. Will the gentleman give me that time?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I can not do so without extending the time, because I have agreed to let one person have the hour. The gentleman from Mississippi may have the time in case the gentleman to whom I have yielded will divide his time with him. I will state that there had been only one request until you made your request now, and that is why I asked for one hour on this side.

Mr. HARRISON. Can not the gentleman amend his request and make it three hours?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do not think, unless the House sits late to-night, that we can get through.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 20150, the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that when the bill is closed we have an hour of general debate on either side?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I make that request.

Mr. MANN. What is the request?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The request is that when the bill is closed we have one hour on each side for general debate; that is, after the conclusion of the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. I object to that. That changes the procedure of the House.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We ask for the reading of the bill then.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, H. R. 20150, with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20150) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for an hour.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, in order to see if we can arrange for a time for general debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20150, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] is recognized.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will make this request, that the general debate be concluded within three hours, one hour to be controlled by myself, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE], half an hour by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and half an hour by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the general debate shall be limited to three hours, one hour to be controlled by himself, another hour to be controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE], half an hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and half an hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I was going to reserve the right to object. I am not going to object, but I want to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] how late he intends, as chairman of the committee, to sit to-day?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think possibly until 6 o'clock, two hours and a half from now.

Mr. MANN. That will depend.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As long as may be desired. I do not know.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I now move, Mr. Speaker, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20150, the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20150, the Indian appropriation bill, with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20150) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] is recognized for an hour.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] if he desires to use some time first?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Not at present.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I will yield one hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to speak on the question of rural credits. I shall confine myself principally to the element of State aid and to the attitude of the present administration toward rural-credit legislation.

In the wide discussion which has been given to rural credits there has developed no disagreement as to the necessity for additional legislation or as to the large measure of benefits which will inure to American agriculture from its enactment. On a former occasion, when I had the honor to address this House

on the subject of land mortgage banks, I assumed that there existed a true spirit of cooperation among the friends and advocates of this legislation to perfect a workable bill which could command wide confidence and support; and that the only contention which was present or which could arise was that noble contention or rather emulation of who best can work and best agree. For this reason I did not review the history of the growth and development of these institutions in other lands and among foreign peoples, but confined my remarks to a discussion of concrete propositions which have been advanced by groups of men for the consideration of Congress. I was working under the conviction that the fruition of all our labors was awaiting—and only awaiting—the appearance of a measure admittedly well adapted to the present-day conditions of American farm life and agreeable to the temperament of American farm citizenship. In this it seems that my position was not well taken; that a difference over principle and not of details is halting progress in this body and is preventing the consideration of this legislation.

The chairman of the subcommittee on banking and currency, Mr. BULKLEY, of Ohio, stated to the House recently that in his opinion a controversy over Government aid is the only thing which has prevented a complete agreement on rural credits. This is equivalent to saying that a disagreement over Government aid is preventing legislation on this subject. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] is one of the ablest Members of this body. His large store of information, his industrious habits, enthusiastic temperament, and uniformly courteous manner have won for him the high esteem of the membership of this House; and his opinion will be taken by all to reflect his mature conviction that unless an accommodation can be secured this legislation will fail at this session. His declaration demands that this discordant element be given a most thorough discussion.

Second in importance, if, indeed, it can be said to be subordinate in any degree, is his criticism of Secretary Houston's attitude and utterances on this subject. The remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] will be taken by the general public in connection with the circular issued by a committee purporting to represent the progressive granges of the Nation and other like publications. The Washington Herald, of December 28, contains the following comment on the remarks under consideration:

A veiled attack upon the administration for its failure to insist upon rural-credit legislation at this session was made in the House a week ago by Representative BULKLEY, of Ohio, a Democratic leader; and there is a considerable element of Democrats in both Houses that feel resentful over the administration's apparent abandonment of the rural-credit bill.

The impression has been created, whether designedly or not, that Secretary Houston is antagonistic toward the enactment of rural-credit legislation, and that in this manner and to this degree the present administration is violating the pledged faith of the Democratic Party to the detriment of the American farmer.

In a country like ours, where all power permanently resides in the people and the exercise of it is delegated to certain officials for limited time and for specific purposes, no question can exceed in importance that of the good faith and honesty of purpose of those who hold this delegated power. If it be true that the administration is covertly opposing rural-credit legislation and is not in good faith desiring to redeem the pledges of the Democratic Party, then this most important fact should be known. If it be untrue, then there should be an equally frank acknowledgment, and there should be an end to all effort to shift responsibility for delay from Congress to the executive branch of the Government. For these reasons, I shall confine my remarks to a discussion of these two propositions.

I wish to disavow any controversy on the part of the United States commission over the question of Government aid as applied to rural-credit legislation. In our report, page 22, in discussing the feature of State aid, the commission said:

There is room for honest difference of opinion as to the question of State aid, if only European experience is consulted. In every instance in Europe where Government capital has been granted to establish mortgage credit the results have been favorable to the agricultural interests of that nation. It is our opinion that such aid should not be extended in the United States.

I desire now to elaborate on that opinion and to give in detail some of the reasons which led to that unanimous conclusion on the part of the commission.

I had the very great privilege to visit some of the leading European countries and of studying the actual conditions of their farm life as it exists to-day. The universal testimony is to the effect that conditions have improved immeasurably in peasant life since the date when these institutions were first

organized in those countries; but taking conditions as they now exist and comparing them with the conditions which surround American farm homes, the conviction is forced that European precedents are of but little, if any, value in framing American legislation to meet American conditions and purposes. This was the conclusion of practically every American official resident in Europe whom we met during our visit, as well as that of American business men with European residence and connections. In Europe the great struggle has been to escape from the servitudes imposed by the feudal system and to assist the agricultural class to rise from a state of serfdom imposed by an absolute government to that of an independent land-owning class. The only parallel which we can find in our history would be the struggles of the emancipated slaves who were liberated as a result of our Civil War. Down at the base of practically every system of government-capitalized mortgage banks in Europe lay an urgent necessity for social reform. This condition is so well understood by European students that this class of institutions was not emphasized before our commission. Dr. Augsbin, in an address before our commission in Berlin on the subject of mortgage banks, used these words:

The American farmer of to-day does not need any subsidy, nor would he accept it; but what he needs is a cheaply acquired credit on long-term mortgages and with the right of amortization. These credit facilities provided to your farmers would secure to your country greater productivity at less cost from the farms now under cultivation and, above all, give you more farms and more farmers. (*Agricultural Cooperation and Rural Credit in Europe*, p. 390.)

Dr. Augsbin is an authority on this subject who was delegated by the German Government to present it to our commission from a German viewpoint. He has traveled extensively in this country, and is firm in the opinion that no subsidy is necessary from the Government in order to establish mortgage banking in this country and to give our farmers cheap credit on long-time mortgage security. The conclusion of our commission is thus sustained by this eminent German authority, who is well acquainted with the operations of subsidized systems of mortgage banks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Will it disconcert the gentleman to yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It will not disconcert me, but I will say to the gentleman, if it is just the same to him, I would prefer to continue and quote some indorsements which I have prepared, and then, if I have time, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. President Wilson has also supported our position by declaring that—

The farmers, of course, ask, and should be given, no special privileges, such as extending to them the credit of the Government itself.

Secretary Houston states in his annual report that—

There seems to be no emergency which requires or justifies Government assistance to the farmers directly through the use of the Government's cash or the Government's credit. It is the judgment of the best students of economic conditions here that there is needed to supplement existing agencies a proper land-mortgage banking system, operating through private funds, just as other banking systems operate, and this judgment is shared by the leaders of economic thought abroad.

Mr. Herrick, late ambassador to France and a profound student of banking, both in Europe and America, strongly supports the commission in its position on State aid. In his recent volume on "Rural Credits" Mr. Herrick warns against Government subsidy to mortgage banks as class legislation and declares it to be a perversion of the proper functions of government in a Republic. He states that in nearly all European Governments where direct Government aid has been granted it has led to bureaucracy, favoritism, and politics. Even more significant, and to American lawmakers more important, is his declaration that financial assistance is no longer extended in Europe except to institutions organized to help the poor to acquire homes or small tracts of agricultural lands. (P. 224, *Rural Credits*, by Herrick.)

Mr. David Lubin, of California, has done more to agitate and educate our people on this subject than any other American citizen. He has resided in Europe for some years, is the American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture, and has an intimate personal knowledge of conditions in both Europe and America. His ability and sound judgment as a business man have enabled him to achieve signal success in agricultural and commercial fields of activity. Mr. Lubin is absolutely opposed to the grants, either of money or credit, by the Government to found systems of mortgage credit in the United States, and indorses the purely mutual associations of borrowers as the best instrumentality to secure cheap credit on long-time mortgage security.

Jesse E. Pope, in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* for August, 1914, in a discussion of "Agricultural credit," speaking of European conditions, says:

Not only does direct financial assistance by the State tend to demoralize the individual, but in the long run it also dries up the sources of credit. This is the testimony of most Europeans who have given their lives to the solution of the problems of agricultural credit. Some of them at first advocated State aid; but when confronted with its results they became its ardent opponents. (*August Quarterly*, p. 739.)

And, finally, our commission secures a most emphatic indorsement in the Executive Bulletin, by the Hon. Emmet O'Neal, governor of Alabama, chairman of the committee of 12 governors of States which was appointed at the governors' conference at Richmond, Va., to prepare bills on rural credits to be submitted to the several State legislatures. This committee, after full consideration of the subject, decided that it was impractical to draft specific bills, but voted to draft a report declaring the fundamental principles which, in their judgment, should control legislation on this subject. The report is dated November 10, 1914. I quote in full what is said under the heading of Government subsidy.

The establishing of a wise, just, or successful system of land-mortgage banks can be accomplished without direct Federal aid, without subsidies or loans. With just and liberal enactments, properly safeguarding the lender, with rigid appraisement of values, with a simplified system of land-title registration or insurance, the savings of the Nation will gladly invest in these securities. No form of investment can be made more attractive or secure. Bills which seek direct Federal loans are unwise and will only delay or jeopardize the success of legislation on this subject.

Your committee indorses the views of the United States commission when they declare, "It is wise legislation rather than liberal appropriations or loans which rural credit mostly needs at our hands."

These indorsements can be extended to great lengths; but more impressive than words are actual accomplishments; and it is undeniably true that mortgage banking is being rapidly organized and extended in the United States without State aid, thus verifying by the results of actual experience the recommendation of our commission. The building and loan associations in the United States are extending their operations to include farm mortgages on periodic payments. In the State of Ohio these associations report aggregate farm loans exceeding \$11,000,000, with a maximum period of maturity running to 16 years.

In Indiana, under a recent State law, a million-dollar corporation has been organized, with a paid-in capital of \$250,000, to grant long-time credit on real-estate mortgages by issuing debenture bonds. This corporation is financed without any State aid and with no exclusive grants of territory. The president of this corporation in a recent letter to me states that the demand for copies of their constitution and articles of incorporation is so great as to necessitate having a special edition printed for general distribution. Real-estate loans are now being granted in Wisconsin under State law and without State aid, and a land bank with a minimum capital of \$100,000 is being organized in New York to grant loans under similar general terms and conditions. In the State of Illinois Mr. Woodruff, of Joliet, has organized a successful and rapidly growing mortgage business by issuing debenture land bonds, based on real-estate mortgages on Illinois improved farm lands and guaranteed by the capital of his banking corporation. Without the aid of supervision, either by the State or Nation, Mr. Woodruff has sold large issues of land bonds. His plan of operation is that of a private joint-stock bank, issuing debenture bonds. In a letter to me Mr. Woodruff indorses the position of the United States commission. In opposition to the statement of the gentleman from Ohio that mortgage credit can probably not be successfully organized without direct Government financial assistance, I will place the developments in these five great agricultural States—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and New York. Thus the position of our commission is not only sustained by the mature convictions of students and political economists, but also by the actual growth and development of successful institutions over a large and representative area of our Nation.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I would prefer to wait until I shall have completed my remarks and then I will gladly yield to the gentleman, if I have time.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] did not quote a single authority or American precedent to sustain his contention that direct financial aid by the Government is essential to the successful organization of agricultural credit in the United States, but rests his contention on historical precedents. I have quoted Mr. Herrick to the effect that even the countries of Europe have abandoned subsidies, but I wish now to examine

more carefully the conditions under which such a policy was originally adopted. Any study of European institutions which neglects to give particular attention to the social and economic conditions of the inhabitants of those countries at the moment of the organization of such institutions will fail to secure correct conclusions.

In order to draw a contrast between the problem as it was then presented to those Governments and as it is now presented to us I desire to refer to a recent gathering of farmers in my own State. In the summer of 1913 I had the honor to deliver an address before the cattle feeders and corn growers of our State on the occasion of their annual picnic. The meeting was held on the historic battle field of old Tippecanoe, and the attendance included, as it always does, representative farmers from every county in the State. A census was taken of the attendance and of the automobiles parked on the grounds. There were 1,945 machines, with an aggregate value of not less than \$2,000,000. This meeting can be duplicated in perhaps any of the corn-belt States. Large numbers of automobiles can be seen at any farm sale or neighborhood picnic in any farm community.

Let us contrast this picture of wealth and business ability with the conditions which prevailed in Germany at the time when the first association was formed in that country. It is a picture of a country laid desolate by the ravages of a seven-years' war. The Government granted \$216,000 as an aid to the organization and operation of this association, which has been cited by the gentleman from Ohio as a reason why we should now give direct aid to mortgage banks in this country. I quote from Herrick's Rural Credits, page 37:

Many States had been entirely ruined, notably those in which armies had been encamped for a long time. The soil remained, it is true, but all which was necessary to give it value disappeared. Buildings were burned. The scattered live stock had died of hunger. Farm implements were rusted and rotten and the fields lay uncultivated. The value of the land had diminished 50 or 60 per cent, and where the owner had owed a large part before the war he was utterly unable to pay the interest on his debt, to say nothing about the principal at maturity. Numerous defaults were made, and the resulting foreclosures reduced the land values still further and excited the distrust of the money lender, who thereupon demanded repayment of all sums advanced, and thus brought about a crisis.

It has happily been more than 50 years since such conditions prevailed in any section of our country; and what shall be said of that statesmanship which seeks to go back to the desolation of the Civil War and to the miseries of the days of reconstruction to find conditions which might justify the passage of legislation which is urged to further increase the happy and prosperous conditions of to-day?

Reference has been made to Hungary, and the institutions of that kingdom have been selected in part by the subcommittee on Banking and Currency as their model. Let us review the conditions under which this institution was organized and subsidized in part by the Government. I quote from Rural Credit and Cooperation in Hungary, pages 26-27. This is a volume compiled by the Hungarian Government expressly for the use of the United States commission in making a study of their national institutions during our visit to that country.

It was this class (the gentry landowners) which suffered most heavily from the havoc wrought during the war of independence, 1848-49, and from the grave economic consequences of the same, as well as from the various measures taken by the absolute government.—In particular, the confiscation and destruction of 60,000,000 florins (\$24,000,000) worth of Hungarian bank notes, the suspension of the moratorium that had been granted to landowners at the very time when an enormous slump in the price of corn had taken the world by surprise, and the very injudicious and inopportune restrictive policy of the absolute government toward Hungarian savings banks. This combination of circumstances made the transition to a more modern system of farming in conformity with the changed conditions practically a catastrophe for the land-owning middle class. At the same time the cheapest rate of interest at which mortgage loans could be secured, even on unencumbered real estate, was 18 to 20 per cent. Nor was the lot of the emancipated vassals a better one.

Again we have a recital of war's desolation, radical change in social condition of inhabitants, and the repressive acts of an absolute government. Not even in the desolation and miseries following our great Civil War in the Southland can parallel conditions be established.

Russia has been drawn upon to contribute precedents to justify the grants of direct aid to mortgage banks in the United States under the policy of our "new freedom." In regard to territorial expanse Russia and the United States have great similarity, but in no other respect can a parallel be drawn. I have seen it stated recently that 70 per cent of the Russian peasants can neither read nor write.

The history of mortgage banking in Russia, as we are considering it, dates from the liberation of the serfs and thus involves the question of social reform. For a description of the actual conditions I quote from Mortgage Banking in Russia, by Fredericksen:

"The liberation of the serfs in 1860 marks an epoch in all things Russian. The change itself was of less immediate consequence to most serfs than to their masters. The former wanted to be free and to become the owners of the land. The latter wanted them to be free but to have no land. What took place was a division of the land, giving to 8,000,000 'souls' (male peasants paying the capitation tax), or about 20,000,000 persons, about 30 per cent of the land, the nobility retaining 24 per cent and the Crown and the Crown tenants owning the remainder. Each 'soul' obtained from 3 to 4 'deciatines,' giving to every family of three male members from 25 to 40 acres. The peasants had hoped for more land, and in many cases preferred compulsory labor on the manor to compulsory purchase of the land now adopted. Each village community was, when the change was finally completed at the accession of Alexander III, compelled to purchase its land from the Government in common, paying to the Government besides the interest at 6 per cent a small annual installment which will redeem the land in 49 years and which is assessed with other taxes on each village community. The nobles are paid for the land in Government bonds of different kinds. Thus the old village community was continued, and to-day the 'three-field system,' with a lot around each house owned individually, long narrow scattered strips of plow land allotted periodically, and pasture land held in common is still the usual mode of Russian agriculture."

We have here presented as the chief elements the liberation of a generation of serfs, the forced division, sale, and purchase of the lands of a great empire with the Government credit financing the undertaking.

It is admitted that the Government treasury lost large sums in taxes, remitted to the debt-owing liberated serfs, while maintaining the payments which the Government was pledged to make to the nobles whose estates were forcibly taken and divided among their former tenants. Happily no such condition ever prevailed in the United States, nor can our Government ever have similar motives for taking such extraordinary legislative process.

The history of France has been drawn upon to sustain the contention which the advocates of subsidy legislation are raising. That nation has unhappily passed through social and political revolution, which was caused in large part by the miseries and wrongs endured by her peasant population. The guillotine was erected in the public square of Paris. These conditions did not suddenly develop, but were the growth of generations of misgovernment and misrule. In speaking of the general conditions prevailing in France, Herrick says:

In the beginning of the last century credit facilities in France were in bad condition, mainly because of defective laws regarding the registration of instruments affecting the title or possession of land. A lender who took a mortgage was never sure of recovering his claim in case of foreclosure. Consequently money was scarce and usury was rife. The land was so heavily encumbered with debts which had been accumulated for generations that its returns were barely sufficient to pay taxes and annual dues. In 1826 the farmers and landowners were on the verge of bankruptcy.

These conditions grew worse until, in 1852, the Credit Foncier was organized in part with capital supplied by the State. It is a joint-stock bank, securing its successive increases of capital by the sale of shares of stock to individual investors. The bank does not do an exclusive farm business, but loans to municipalities and on urban properties, and finances large projects in the French African colonies. These loans constitute the larger part of its operations, and it is not contended that this bank has ever supplied even a large fractional part of the loans to French farmers. Less than 10 per cent of the total rural mortgage indebtedness of France is held by the Credit Foncier, after enjoying a monopoly and Government subsidy for 62 years. Within that time France has lost 40 per cent of her rural population, and has recently enacted legislation granting a loan of \$2,000 to any French citizen to purchase a farm home, and promises a pension for life to him if he will reside on the tract so purchased until he is 65 years of age. The Government of France also gives her farmers free State insurance against losses by hailstorms. Other systems of rural banks are assisted by the Government. In summing up his discussion of French agricultural credit Mr. Herrick, who is the best American authority on this subject, says:

State aid, which has been so lavishly extended in France, is a conspicuous failure when considered from the viewpoint of the hopes entertained in 1890. Even its partisans are far from satisfied with the progress made, and are now contemplating amendments to the laws in order to bring about vital changes in the credit Agricolt Mutuel.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I would prefer, Mr. Chairman, to go on with the remarks as I have them prepared, and after I close I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman will not then have any time to yield. We have heard a great many of these rural-credit talks, but we have not had any rural-credit legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman is discussing a very important question, and there ought to be a quorum here to hear him. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point. This is only to bring out both sides of the question. I ask that the speaker be allowed to finish his remarks.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman a question a little while ago, and he declined to be interrupted; and I now make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-one Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FOSTER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 20150) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] desires leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] desires unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BATHRICK. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I have already objected.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOWARD) there were—ayes 15, noes 24.

Accordingly the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-one Members present—not a quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the Chair state that there is not a quorum present?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were—ayes 29, noes 15.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, January 2, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$40,000 to enable the Government of the United States to participate in the Second Pan American Scientific Congress to be held at the city of Washington, D. C., in October, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1468); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of mouth of Brazos River, up to Freeport, Tex., with a view to securing a depth of 25 feet (H. Doc. No. 1469); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CURRY, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 391) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1256), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 20470) to divorce transportation in interstate and foreign commerce from manufacture, mining, production, and dealing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 20471) to secure to the United States a monopoly of electrical means for the transmission of intelligence for hire; to provide for the acquisition by the Post Office Department of the telephone networks; and to license certain telephone lines, radio and telegraph agencies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 20472) providing for a site and public building for a post office at Anaconda, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 20473) to provide for enlarging the United States building at Waterbury, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Utah: A bill (H. R. 20474) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain lands to the State of Utah and to accept from said State certain other lands in lieu thereof; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TOWNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 395) authorizing the President of the United States of America to prohibit by proclamation the exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 20475) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 20476) to correct the military record of John Minster; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 20477) granting a pension to Laura J. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 20478) granting a pension to Joseph H. McIntyre; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 20479) granting a pension to Lillie R. Abbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 20480) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Glaspy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20481) granting an increase of pension to Dixon M. Hepburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20482) granting an increase of pension to Peter Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 20483) granting a pension to William A. Bowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20484) granting a pension to James J. Huff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 20485) granting an increase of pension to Matthias Hartenschwiller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 20486) granting an increase of pension to Artemas C. Barclay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 20487) granting a pension to James E. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 20488) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Brackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 20489) granting an increase of pension to Evalyn Wakefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20490) for the relief of Edson Watson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 20491) granting a pension to Rosa L. Huebner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20492) granting an increase of pension to James Sterns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20493) granting an increase of pension to Andrew R. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 20494) granting a pension to Mary Gertrude Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 20495) granting a pension to Arthur L. Perry; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of J. L. Amstutz and 37 other citizens of Wayne County, Ohio, asking for the passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petitions of 100 citizens of Jackson, Mich., favoring House joint resolution 377, relative to export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of Mrs. R. I. Gammell, of Providence, R. I., protesting against equal suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of C. A. Crombe, George W. Eddy, Walter Hazard, of Wickford; Mrs. Sarah M. R. Aldrich, Mrs. Alice B. Ham, Marion W. Jenks, Mrs. J. W. North, Ellen M. Anthony, Barton P. Jenks, Rhode Island State Grange, and Rhode Island Woman Suffrage Association, of Providence; Helena Sturtevant, of Middletown; and Pawtucket Woman Suffrage League, of Pawtucket, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring equal suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of citizens of the second New York congressional district, favoring House joint resolution 377, relative to munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Branch No. 97, Catholic Knights of America, protesting against the publication of the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Orange Grove Lodge, No. 97, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the Cummins-Goeke bill (H. R. 17894); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Central Labor Council, Los Angeles, Cal., relative to increase in the wages of the employees on the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of employees in engine and train service, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of the Cummins-Goeke bills (S. 6165 and H. R. 17894); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. C. Ernst, of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against printing of return envelopes by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SWITZER: Protests of 820 citizens of the tenth congressional district of Ohio, petitioning for legislation to forbid the use of the United States mails to The Menace and similar publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirtieth New York district, favoring the passage of S. 3672, for the straightening of the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 2, 1915.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 29, 1914.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is the unfinished business, House bill 6060, the so-called immigration bill. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I raise the point of the lack of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Brandagee	Gronna	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Hardwick	Overman	Smoot
Burton	James	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Johnson	Perkins	Swanson
Clapp	Kern	Reed	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Robinson	Townsend
Culberson	McCumber	Sheppard	Vardaman
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	White
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gallinger	Norris	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. REED. I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE]. I believe he will be able to return to the Senate some time later in the day.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. He is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and that he is paired on all votes with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SWANSON. My colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness in his family. He is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. LODGE. My colleague [Mr. WEEKS] is unavoidably absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I make this announcement to stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is not present. The Secretary will call the list of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. SHAFROTH and Mr. THOMAS answered to their names when called.

Mr. HOLLIS entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The second roll call still discloses the absence of a quorum. What is the pleasure of the Senators present?

Mr. KERN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will take due notice and enforce the order accordingly.

Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. BORAH entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 19906) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. PITTMAN presented the credentials of FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, chosen by the electors of the State of Nevada a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and ordered to be filed.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment, which is merely to make the bill conform to the present law: On page 26, line 2, following the second semicolon, I move to insert "whether in possession of \$50, and, if less, how much." That has been suggested in order to keep the statistical tables correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will note the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not hear the statement of the Senator from South Carolina, and I should like to have the Secretary report the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.